Jesuit-Krauss-McCormick Library
BT201 .S353
Schmidt, Nathaniel, 1862-1939. MAIN
The prophet of Nazareth / by Nathaniel S
3 9967 00121 8457

ACCESSION NUMBER 30073

SHELF NUMBER BT201 S353

The Virginia Library

McCormick

Theological Seminary

of the

Presbyterian Church, Chicago.

From the _____ Fund.

RECEIVED _____

2/139
2.50

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/bwb_C0-ABU-791

THE PROPHET OF NAZARETH


The MMCo.

THE PROPHET OF NAZARETH

BY

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT

PROFESSOR OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES
IN CORNELL UNIVERSITY
DIRECTOR OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF
ARCHÆOLOGY IN JERUSALEM

New York
THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.
1905
All rights reserved

Copyright, 1905
By THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Set up and electrotyped
Published December, 1905

VIRGINIA LIBRARY
MCCORMICK
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Mason Press
Syracuse, New York

T1
201
S353

In Memoriam

VIKTOR RYDBERG EBENEZER DODGE
AUGUST DILLMANN

Dies diem docet

PREFACE

This volume is not the manifesto of a school, a sect, or a party. The author acknowledges with gratitude the helpful suggestions and inspiring influence of every great thinker and every faithful worker with whom he has come in contact. But he has endeavored, so far as possible, to see with his own eyes the character of each important problem, and to present in his own language, simply and unequivocally, the conclusions to which many years of study and reflection have led him. In attempting to make a comprehensive statement within narrow limits of space, he has often been obliged to give the bare results where it would have been a pleasure to outline the course of protracted investigation. More frequently, a few suggestions of decisive facts will convince the reader familiar with the problems that nothing has been taken for granted without fresh examination. Wherever it seemed necessary to indicate carefully the grounds for a view not yet fully understood or generally adopted, the author has had no hesitancy in doing so at sufficient length. Particularly is this the case with the question as to the origin and significance of the term "son of man." As the author was the first to suggest that Jesus never used this term concerning himself, either to claim Messiahship in any sense, or to hint that he was "a mere man," or "the true man," but in some pregnant utterances used it in reference to "man" in general, his duties, rights, and privileges, he has felt it incumbent upon himself to attempt such a re-interpretation of the life and teaching of Jesus in the light of this conviction as has been urgently and rightly demanded.

To bring out more fully the significance of this changed estimate of Jesus, it appeared desirable to examine the basis of ecclesiastical Christology in the supposed Messianic

prophecies and types of the Old Testament, and the real teachings concerning the Messiah in later Jewish literature, as well as the character and intrinsic worth of the Christ of dogma. It has been the aim of the author to treat with sympathy and reverence a conception that has for so many centuries furnished spiritual nourishment to men, and to point out the historic value, not less real because relative and transitory, of this and kindred ideas destined to pass away; but also to set the old and the new over against each other so clearly that men may see that there is no possible return to the past, and no permanent escape from the consequences of scientific research by such compromises as are affected by many at the present time. The abandonment of erroneous positions is a duty, even if it implies uncertainty and apparent loss. It should be regarded as an inestimable privilege, when it renders possible a deeper insight into the historic reality, and when it becomes manifest that this reality transcends in moral value the fiction it displaces.

Just and thoughtful men will always remember with gratitude the master-builders who reared the imposing structure of Christian dogma and the faithful believers of every name and denomination who have translated its most valuable thought into lives of spiritual beauty. But as the blessings of a truer knowledge and a larger faith become apparent, they will also accord due honor to the master-miners who have shattered the foundations of untenable dogmas, and most of all, to the souls who, free from the bondage of external authority or the ambition for earthly rewards, have passionately striven for the truth, drawn inspiration from noble lives, imposed upon themselves wise rules of conduct, and labored for the emancipation and improvement of the human race, in truest imitation of him who lived and died for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.

The last revision of this work has been made in Palestine. Jews, Christians and Muslims have covered the whole land with a net-work of traditions. It would be difficult to find a place mentioned in the Bible that has not been identi-

fied, or a story told in its pages that has not been located. The pilgrims to these sacred sites nourish their faith by beholding the very spots where the great miracles of the past took place, and see in the more or less ancient relics which "are with us to this day" evidences of their occurrence. It is sad to reflect that the loss of this naïve faith would probably rob most of them of the only great enthusiasm or touch of ideality that ever enters into their monotonous existence. Less sympathetic is the credulity of learned men who easily persuade themselves of the accuracy of any tradition concerning the scenes of Jesus' life that can be traced back to the time of Constantine, as though there were not room enough in three centuries for many a memory to pass away and many a loose conjecture to grow up into a time-honored tradition! As the student of the literary documents must go behind his text, seeking to reconstruct its original form and estimate its value, so the archaeologist must free himself from the tyranny of topographical tradition, and learn to treat it as a useful servant. If at first the scantiness of positive results seems a loss, there gradually comes a sense of real gain.

For, after all, it was in this little land that Jesus lived and died. His eyes looked up to this blue Syrian sky, and rested lovingly upon these hills and valleys. In the vicinity of yonder lake of Galilee he worked as a carpenter and taught as a prophet. In this city and its immediate neighborhood he spent his last days. Here, as elsewhere, nature sets its stamp upon man. In spite of all changes, the people of the land has preserved through the ages substantially the same manner of life and modes of speech, social conventions, customs and occupations, religious views and practices, and general outlook upon the world. The Arabic dialect spoken is more like Hebrew than the language of the Qur'ân is: and the ordinary fellahin of to-day probably resemble the Galilean peasantry of nineteen centuries ago more than the modern Jew does, with the Talmud, the Ghetto and the Renaissance in his blood. It was with such simple folk as one sees every day in the villages of Palestine

that Jesus grew up and mingled as a man, and the classes with which he came into conflict may still be found in this holy city of three religions. Only here was the career of the Prophet of Nazareth possible. To understand both the factors that determined his character and his real greatness, his personality and his message should be seen against the background of his land as well as of his people and his time. The life of Jesus fits its environment in nature not less perfectly than its place in history.

During the preparation of this work many valuable suggestions and friendly counsels have been offered by Dr. James M. Whiton, for which the author desires to express his gratitude. In dedicating the volume to the memory of three illustrious teachers to whom he owes much, he wishes to intimate also his indebtedness to three universities where it was his privilege to study, and to three nations to which he is bound by the strongest ties.

JERUSALEM, January, 1905.

THE AUTHOR.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE CHRIST OF THE CREEDS 1

CHAPTER II

THE DECLINE OF DOGMA 11

CHAPTER III

THE OLD TESTAMENT BASIS 35

CHAPTER IV

THE JEWISH MESSIAH 68

CHAPTER V

THE SON OF MAN 94

CHAPTER VI

THE SON OF GOD 135

CHAPTER VII

THE LOGOS 159

CHAPTER VIII

THE SECONDARY SOURCES 174

CHAPTER IX

THE GOSPELS 205

CHAPTER X

THE LIFE OF JESUS 240

CHAPTER XI

THE TEACHING OF JESUS 293

CHAPTER XII

THE HISTORIC INFLUENCE OF JESUS 318

CHAPTER XIII

THE PRESENT PROBLEM 340

CHAPTER XIV

THE LEADERSHIP OF JESUS 360

EXCURSUS A

GNOSTICISM 387

EXCURSUS B

THE COLLEGIA VICENTINA 390

EXCURSUS C

THE RESURRECTION 392

INDEXES

INDEX OF SUBJECTS 399
INDEX OF AUTHORS 408
INDEX OF TEXTS 414

THE PROPHET OF NAZARETH

CHAPTER I

THE CHRIST OF THE CREEDS

Every man is a creed-maker. He forms his view of the world by observation of external reality and reflection upon the states of his own consciousness. His interpretation of life is subject to constant change, and is at no moment quite identical with that of any other man. In proportion as his range of vision is wide and his judgment accurate, his creed differentiates itself and assumes a distinctive character. Disinterested search for truth by capable and independent minds leads to diversity of belief, as well as to increase of knowledge.

But there is also a collective creed-making. Similarity of origin and environment tends to create similarity of life and thought. In family, political society, and cult-community, there is a ceaseless labor to produce a common creed and to express in common customs this corporate faith. A tradition, based on the accumulated experience and thought of many generations, presents itself as an invaluable aid to the individual in the formative period of his life, and continues to be his chief assistance, stimulus, and corrective, whatever new facts he may discover, and however discriminating his judgment may be. This tradition changes with the growth of the social organism. A collective creed never implies uniformity of belief. But the transformation is slower than in the case of the individual, and similarity of view is a strong cohesive force. The common creed produces unity of purpose, efficiency of practical endeavor, and assurance of faith.

The power of beliefs largely adopted by society, and embodied in its life, to shape the thoughts of men, is counterbalanced by the reaction upon society of new ideas backed by strong personalities. The centripetal force is equalled in the long run by the centrifugal force, the tendency to preserve the type by the tendency to vary the type. Where freedom of thought and speech gives opportunity for the development of a distinct personal creed and for influencing public opinion, while the social creed, whether symbolized in formulas or merely found in a general understanding, is sensitive and flexible, the balance of these forces is best maintained. To the importance of the personal initiative is due the development of creeds concerning great men. Mighty rulers holding nations in subjection, forceful characters assuming leadership, wonder-workers possessing unusual powers, sagacious interpreters of nature's life, enthusiastic heralds of some fresh evangel, naturally become the objects of interest, curiosity and worship. The mysterious power exercised by these men is more readily felt than explained. No human life can be fully known. Much must always be left for imagination to supply. Imagination may resort to local setting and historic circumstance, or it may draw upon the general characteristics of a class. A man's inner life cannot escape the effect of the nature that surrounds him, the social *milieu* in which he finds himself. A prophet is likely to do a prophet's work, a king to shine in royal splendor, a sage to unlock nature's mysteries. The influence of a great man is only in part due to what he actually says, or does, or is: in a large measure it is due to this tendency to eke out the known facts with more or less plausible conjectures drawn from environment, analogy, or ideal.

At a certain stage of human development, the secret of heroic lives is found in their connection with a higher world. Beings greater than man, it is thought, give to their chosen ones strength that is more than human, and knowledge that lies beyond the reach of man's unaided intellect. But such gifts would not come to them, if they were not of finer clay

than ordinary mortals. Their destiny is higher, their origin more sublime. When they depart from earth, they are not left to see corruption, but go to share the divine nature, and to receive divine worship. When they appear on earth, they are not born of the will of man, but come from a celestial world and have a divine paternity. Euhemerus suggested that all gods had once lived as men upon the earth. This is a defective generalization. Countless men, warriors, judges, patriarchs, kings, sages, prophets, have, indeed, become gods. But innumerable gods have also become men, not only by the gradual transformation of nature-spirits into the image of man, but by an actual entrance upon the life of a human being, by an incarnation.

It is natural that the category of divinity dominates the conception of even the earthly life of such personalities. Faith does not live by verifiable facts of history alone; it clings for its support to the present ideal; it seeks the eternal truth and grace that once flashed forth in sudden rays of incarnate beauty.

One of the mightiest conceptions that ever swayed the mind of man is the Christ of the great ecumenic creeds. These creeds register the results of centuries of thought; they set forth the finished product of a long development. The roots of the idea lie deep in Hebrew antiquity. The prophetic movement prepared the way for it. Political hopes, doomed to disappointment, rose to furnish the material of its growth. In the apocalyptic literature of the Roman period, the Messiah appeared. An interpretation, true to prevalent methods and fit to meet the needs of the age, discovered his lineaments in many a passage of the Hebrew Bible, and in many a person, custom, or institution, a type of his character and reign. Early Christian literature, not less than the Aramaic Targums, testifies to this. Thus the Old Testament became the source whence apparently the Messianic ideal issued forth. The converging point of all its streams was the life of Jesus. If the tradition of this life was enriched by features taken from the prophetic word, the scope of Messianic prophecy was en-

larged at the suggestion of incidents in the biography. But the writers of the New Testament did not only work together Biblical material with the tradition of what Jesus had said and done; they also built upon foundations that had been laid in Greece and in the Orient. The strong Hellenistic element in the New Testament facilitated a continuous development of thought. It was not altogether a new world the first Greek converts to Christianity were bidden to enter. There were, indeed, many ideas that must have seemed very strange, but also some that were quite familiar. The most advanced type of Christology, which to the ordinary Jew was least comprehensible and most objectionable, is likely to have been one of the most congenial. There is no chasm between the latest forms of thought in the New Testament and the conceptions prevalent in other Christian writings of the second century. However imperfect their methods of interpretation may appear to modern minds, it would be wrong to charge the Greek apologists and fathers with seriously mistaking the trend of New Testament teaching. And the great ecumenic creeds rest upon patristic Christology. These creeds are a consistent development of certain ideas that unquestionably hold an important place in New Testament literature.[1]

It was honestly felt by some of the keenest minds of the fourth century that the Christ they defined by dogma was none else than the divine personality whose advent was predicted by the Old Testament and proclaimed by the New

[1] Ritschl and his school rightly emphasized the fresh influence of Greek speculation upon the developing Christian dogma that came with the first educated converts from paganism. But they were inclined to overlook the large element of Greek thought that already existed among the Hellenistic Jews, to whom we owe the most important types of Christology in the New Testament. Similarly, the early Unitarians rendered a valuable service by pointing out that the doctrine of the Trinity was nowhere distinctly taught in the New Testament, as had been erroneously maintained, but themselves erred when, seeking Scriptural support for their conception of Jesus, they failed to give their full weight and natural significance to passages that unmistakably tend in the direction of this doctrine.

Testament. This conviction was well nigh inevitable. Was not the Old Testament full of distinct prophecies of the coming of Christ, his life, his death and his resurrection? Did it not contain types clearly pointing to him? Had not these prophecies and types been recognized by New Testament writers, nay, by Jesus himself? Did not his life correspond to the prophetic picture? Had he not claimed to be the Messiah and been declared by God to be his only Son? Were not the miracles he wrought a ratification of his claims? And must he not have been very God to accomplish the work of man's redemption, to abrogate the law, to satisfy the demands of infinite justice, to offer an acceptable sacrifice for the sins of the world, and to open the gates of paradise to all believers? Only a being who was at the same time true God and true man could restore fallen man to his original state of purity, heal the mortal wound inflicted on him in the garden of Eden, overcome the devil's power, and conquer death itself.

While thus the Christ-conception authoritatively presented by the church appeared to be fully verified by the recognized standards of divine revelation, an even more important ratification of the doctrine came from Christian experience. This divinely human being was not simply a historic personage belonging to the past. Nor was he a mere abstraction, a product of idle speculation. He was a present reality, the object of love and worship. He was a living source of spiritual blessings. Communion with him gave power to overcome the bondage of sin, to endure the ills of life, to face courageously even the last enemy. It flooded the soul with a joy that the world could not give, a boundless hope, and a sympathy that reached down to earth's little ones, the weak, the ignorant, the debased. It was a refuge in all hours of need. The believer knew that his Redeemer lived, and that no words could adequately express his supreme worth, from an experience that was more real to him than were the shifting scenes and sensations of earth-bound life. Affection, as well as thought, centered upon him and demanded to know what he was. The def-

inition was a work of adoring love not less than of profound meditation. There were other forces at work. The shadows fall wherever the sun shines. But the chief factors in the construction of Christological dogma were an honest interpretation of the Scriptures and an equally honest interpretation of the facts of Christian experience.

This Christ-conception has been perpetuated by the same forces that gave it existence. If it owed its finally prevailing form to ecclesiastical authority, by ecclesiastical authority it has been upheld. Men have sought to make it their own because of this authority, from love or fear of consequences, or unreflecting conformity. The resources of ecclesiastical power have been employed to discourage men from adopting different views. Yet this external pressure has probably contributed much less than is generally supposed to the longevity of dogma.

Of greater and more permanent significance is the authority ascribed to the Scriptures. As the Christ of the creeds would not have become what he was but for the authority of that divine revelation which, as it was interpreted, outlined precisely such a personality in prophecy and fulfilment, in type and antitype, so he has remained unchanged through the centuries in no small measure by virtue of the authority accorded to these Scriptures which, it was felt, bore witness of him. But even the assertion of infallible authority would not secure such a recognition as this conception has had.

Only a genuine personal conviction can explain the long and general acceptance of the Christ of the creeds. This conviction has, to a great extent, been formed by a conscientious study of the sources. Starting with certain primal assumptions, the student cannot easily reach any other conclusion: and these assumptions are so natural that it does not readily occur to him even to question them. If the tradition that ascribes the Gospels to immediate followers of Jesus is accepted, and the correctness of their use of the Old Testament is taken for granted, the result cannot be doubtful. The early narratives in Genesis will then be regarded

as historical; the political hopes of Israel as Messianic prophecies; personalities, events and institutions of the chosen people as types of Christ; the sayings reported in the Gospels as the very words of Jesus; the lofty claims that some of these utterances contain in connection with the miracles recorded as evidence of a double personality, human and divine, not unfittingly described in the terms of the great creeds. On the other hand, why should not eye-witnesses have written down the story of Jesus' life? And who would be better fitted for interpreting the divine revelation of the past than the immediate recipients of the crowning revelation in which the old found its fulfilment?

Even the most enlightened and truth-seeking of men, proceeding from such general assumptions, would naturally see in the New Testament authority for seeking in the Old Testament a prophetic description of Christ, in the fulfilment of prophecy in the New Testament evidence of the authority of the Old Testament, and in the dogma of the Church a legitimate statement of the most essential teachings of both. A different estimate is precluded by modes of interpretation that receive their sanction from apostolic use. The allegorical method draws attention away from grammatical sense, literary form, and historic setting, to a hidden meaning organically connected with the body of accepted doctrine. It finds the same unchanged ideas everywhere in the Scriptures. Its legacy is a certain inability to distinguish between things that differ, an often unconscious tendency to overlook inconsistencies and contradictions, a proneness to view ideas scattered through a literature extending over a thousand years as integral parts of one system of thought, a lack of historic sense. The very looseness of an interpretation that cannot quite emancipate itself from these effects of the allegorical method may add strength to conviction, since it removes all obstacles and allows subjective faith to see its own reflection in the Bible.

But the most powerful influence tending to perpetuate the Christological dogma is, without question, the association, in the mind of the believer, of the statements of the

creed with the experiences of his own soul. A nature foul with inherited evil proclivities and acquired sinful habits is cleansed and filled with holy aspirations, love of goodness, and spiritual power by contact with the Son of God. Instead of doubt and perplexity, moral weakness and an aimless drifting with the fashions of the world, a fruitless search for pleasure and a cheerless labor, a dull indifference to fate or a constant fear of death, there are the light and power of an all conquering faith, the strenuous effort to realize a high ideal, the joy of work for noble ends, and the hope of an immortal life. The dangers that beset man's life no longer terrify, no earth-born happiness can enthral, the tenderest ties have no power to bind to earth the citizen of a heavenly Jerusalem who lives in mystic union with his Lord. This stream of life points to a living fountain, a source never contaminated with impurity. As the believing soul draws nearer to the Christ, he breathes a purer air; the atmosphere of holiness surrounds him, and he feels more keenly his own sinfulness. The more completely he surrenders his will and heart to his divine Master, the more manifest is his grace. What the Christ is to-day he must have been yesterday. How could he have been born of "the will of the flesh"? Can the pure come from the impure? How could he be the Saviour from sin that a redeemed nature with its every fibre proclaims him to be, unless his life had been an absolutely sinless one? Were the miracles performed by the lake of Galilee more wonderful than the miracles unquestionably wrought in the inner life of many a soul? How could God's Holy One be left in the clutches of death? Must he not be the first-fruits of a resurrection whose power does not wait for death to manifest itself? He whose life is hid with Christ in God is led by his own experience, and no longer because others have told him about the Son of God, to confess that in him the divine that men must worship blends indistinguishably with a humanity that men cannot behold without emulating its supreme virtues.

The Christ of the creeds has thus maintained a hold upon the most advanced nations of mankind chiefly through the

study of the Scriptures and the concurrent testimony of Christian experience. The methods pursued in the study of the Bible rendered its interpretation in all essential points more certain from age to age. The type of Christian experience and character produced under the influence of Christian dogma brought conviction of the essential soundness of this interpretation home to generation after generation of men. This does not imply that the conception has been the same in all minds. In point of fact no two minds have ever conceived of the God-man in precisely the same manner. The world of thought in which a thirteenth century scholastic, or a sixteenth century reformer, moved was in many respects different from that familiar to a Greek father of the fourth century. But the great currents of thought seem to have largely swept past the domain of Christology, and the common formulas represent a considerable similarity of view.

It is impossible to contemplate this wonderful conception that has exercised an influence so vast and uplifting in human history without the deepest reverence and gratitude. A long procession marches down the ages bearing trophies to this Christ. Among them are men of genius and men of faith, evangelists and martyrs, thinkers and reformers, knights and statesmen, missionaries and philanthropists. There are rare and radiant spirits of whom the world was not worthy, pure, high-minded, self-forgetful, rich in faith and hope and charity. And there is an innumerable host of men and women rescued from sensuality and greed to lives of purity and gentle service. These all proclaim him Saviour, Lord and God. In his name they have fought the good fight, borne their burdens gladly, fed the hungry, clothed the naked, freed the slave, lifted up woman, educated the child, brought peace to the earth. If in his name men have also perpetrated deeds of darkness, it has only been necessary to look more closely into his face, even as tradition painted it, to see the look of disapproval. Through him the divine has come very near to the human, time has been lapped in the bosom of eternity, life has received a new meaning.

Perhaps no man ever felt the intrinsic worth of the prophecy, the psalmody, the legislation of the Old Testament as deeply as he who, having looked upon the face of the heavenly Christ, saw the glory vanish from the covenant of the letter. So it may be that the beauty of the Christ is best seen, the grandeur and power of the celestial Son of God are most fully appreciated, by him whose eyes have been entranced by the surpassing glory of the new conception that is destined to take its place, the ideal suggested by the life of Jesus of Nazareth, as a critical study of the records is able to restore it.

CHAPTER II

THE DECLINE OF DOGMA

Parallel with the process through which the collective creed is authoritatively formulated and permanently fixed runs the tendency of individual creed-making to sap its foundations and to produce divergent types of belief. The ethical and religious impulses of primitive Christianity, while furnishing the material for dogma, prevented its crystallization. "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." Where liberty reigns, uniformity is impossible. This liberty, however, in the first period, largely resulted from the predominance of practical interests. Seeing that the world would soon pass away, and the Master return on the clouds as the Messiah, what manner of men ought the disciples of Jesus to be?[1] This was the great question. The emphasis was on conduct.

When, subsequently, reflection upon the character and source of the new life tended to produce a common creed, it remained sensitive to the influence of powerful personalities. Such was the force of the spiritual impact, such the conviction wrought by a deep experience, that these men could not refrain from asserting their right to be heard. Such was their sense of the inexhaustible riches of the truth as it was in Jesus, such their joy in the new world of thought that had been opened to them, that men were inclined to welcome with broad hospitality ideas of different provenience and value. There was indeed no doctrine of toleration, no recognition of the necessity of divergence, or of the right to differ. Dissenters were anathematized. The radicalism of the Pauline epistles claimed for itself a freedom that it was not quite willing to accord to the conservatives. The ad-

[1] 2 *Peter*, ii, 11. This formulation is late, but the thought is early.

vanced theology of the Johannine literature handled the elements of tradition with sovereign independence, and its deep spiritual intuition pointed to love as the essence of life; yet it could not quite refrain from basing fellowship upon doctrinal agreement. But the fact that so widely divergent types of thought as those found in the Synoptic, Pauline and Johannine writings could develop at all, and secure recognition side by side among the treasures of the Church, is none the less significant. It shows that dogma could not crystallize in such an atmosphere.

The allegorical method of the Alexandrian rhetoricians and the epoch-making philosophy of Philo, while supplying the instruments for the development of dogma, were dangerous allies threatening its life. This method, however, saved the Old Testament in its conflict with Greek thought. This philosophy rescued the Messiah. By allegorizing it is possible to see the invisible, to discover behind the literal sense a meaning not intended by the author but demanded by the interpreter, to explain all contradictions and to remove all difficulties. Philo's keen intellect perceived many of the facts that have forced ancient and modern critics to a different estimate of the Bible. But these very facts convinced him of the accuracy of his method. He was persuaded that the world could not have been made in six days, that the first woman was not fashioned from a man's ribs, that serpents cannot speak and fruits cannot give knowledge, and that God is neither subject to fits of passion nor in need of repentance. The words of the Bible could not, therefore, mean what they seemed to mean. They were symbols of deeper spiritual processes. There is no dishonesty in this reasoning, as long as it is sincerely felt to be the only rational way of accounting for certain facts that are frankly admitted. Armed with this method, the Church was prepared to resist the attacks of Gnostic teachers and of such men as Celsus and Porphyry.

The Messianic idea could not thrive except in the soil of Palestine. Here was the throne of the coming King; here was the home of the eschatological speculation that threw

such a glamor about his person. In the rarefied air of Alexandria it was difficult for either the Messianic hope or the apocalyptic frame of mind to survive. Philo's Messiah is a mere shadow that has no place in his system of thought. The hope that a deceased teacher, once known and loved, would come back to earth as the Messiah might fill with enthusiasm the men of Galilee, but not profoundly affect either Greek or barbarian. In the Hellenistic world this exotic plant would have drooped and died but for Philo's thought. The influence of his mind is already felt in the Pauline literature. The political idea has vanished; the apocalyptic conception is gradually disappearing. It is the celestial, archetypal man, the medium of creation, revelation, and redemption, the image and effulgence of the ineffable glory, the Son of God in a Greek metaphysical sense, that dominates. In the Fourth Gospel the *Logos* of Philo has become flesh; the Messiah is transformed into "the only begotten Son;"[1] the pageant in the sky gives place to a mystic fellowship; the resurrection is a spiritual experience.

[1] This reading in John i, 18, is found in Codex Alexandrinus, a number of late uncials, all cursive MSS. but one, the Latin versions, the Curetonian, the Philoxenian, the Palestinian Lectionary, the Georgian, the Armenian, the Slavic, the Anglo-Saxon, some MSS. of the Ethiopic and the Arabic, Athanasius, Chrysostom and the Latin fathers. It is without a rival in the Occident and practically so in the Orient until the fifth century, while it is known in Alexandria in the days of Origen. On the other hand, an important group of witnesses to the text give the reading 'only begotten God.' Among these are Codex Vaticanus, Codex Sinaiticus, Codex Ephraemi, Codex Parisianus 62, the cursive MS. 33, the Peshita, the margin of the Philoxenian, the Coptic, some MSS. of the Ethiopic and a host of patristic writers from Clement of Alexandria on, Arian as well as orthodox. Bousset may be right in thinking that all of these represent the same Egyptian text edited by Hesychius (*Theologische Rundschau*, October, 1903, p. 436) and that in Egypt the original 'son' was corrected into 'God.' Unfortunately this passage is lost in the Sinaitic Syriac. Modern editors and commentators are of divided counsel. The suggestion of Semler and Schultz that the text originally read simply 'the only begotten' has not won any recognition. Tregelles, Hort, Westcott, a majority of English revisers, Harnack, B. Weiss, O. Holtzmann and H. J. Holtzmann have argued in favor of the reading

It was important that the Old Testament should be saved, and the historic continuity preserved. But the cost was great. The infallible authority of the Scriptures might be strongly maintained. But a method that allows the interpreter to read into the Bible the theistic speculations, the psychology and the ethics of Greek philosophy, shifts in reality the seat of authority. Ultimately it is no longer the thought of the Biblical writers that is to him authoritative, but the thought that he himself, with undoubted sincerity, has imported into the text. Under ecclesiastical pressure this thought may be the officially recognized system of doctrine. Where a deeper religious experience loosens the hold of hierarchical power, and leads the thirsty soul to the fountains of living water in the Scriptures, it finds there precisely what, on other grounds, it believes to be true. The highest authority of the mystic is his own inner consciousness. But this subjectivity is the eclipse of dogma.

It was the transformation of the coming Messiah into a god that rendered the Christ cult possible. Without a complete apotheosis, the world would not have been won. It was nothing less than a god that the worshiping heart demanded. The second person of the Trinity, the divine being through whom the universe was made and the redemption effected, met this need. The episode of his humanity, the earthly life of Jesus, sank into the background. It was but the temporary manifestation in the flesh of a divine personality to overcome the powers of evil. His battles with them became a spectacle. At sacred seasons the sufferings of the new deity were set forth dramatically, as had been those of Osiris, Tammuz and Dionysus in the past. Yet even in a god it is the human qualities that are most fascinating. The very cult led the worshipers back to a manhood that invited imitation. The more earnestly this

'God.' (See especially Hort, *Two Dissertations,* 1876, pp. 1-72). Alford, Tischendorf, Ezra Abbott, Scrivener, Schaff, Nestle, Bousset have accepted the reading 'only begotten son.' (See especially Ezra Abbott in *Bibliotheca Sacra,* October, 1861, and *Unitarian Review,* June, 1875).

was undertaken, the more real became the fellowship of his sufferings, the more marked was the return from the Christ of dogma to the Jesus of history.

Among the independent movements of Christian thought that were finally suppressed, none, perhaps, was of greater importance than Gnosticism. Large were the contributions that the Gnostics made to the growing Catholic church. Already the epistolary literature of the New Testament and the Fourth Gospel reveal the attraction and influence of Gnostic thought as well as an unmistakable attitude of hostility and fear. Some of the works of Gnostics on which the Church set its seal of approval were the selection of a canon of Christian Scriptures, the enriching of the cult by hymns, formulas and new sacraments, the establishment of a catechumenate, and the development of a philosophy of emanation. Many of the contentions of the Gnostics rejected by the Church were truer than the views it adopted. Men like Valentinus, Basilides, Marcion and Ptolemy were right in holding that there is a vast difference between the conception of God in the Mosaic legislation and that presented by Jesus, that a god who fashions man out of clay, repents of his work, betrays ignorance, becomes angry, eats flesh, desires animal sacrifices, and fights for Israel against other nations, is more truly designated as "the god of the Jews" than as "the father of mankind." If, for want of such a training as the synagogue provided, these thinkers sometimes failed to understand the Hebrew records, their own education fitted them to see more clearly than even the most radical Jewish Christian the moral and religious differences between the Law and the Gospel. It is possible that the loss of critical insight the Church sustained by adopting a less discriminating view of the Old Testament was made good by a greater freedom from moral excrescences. Although the denunciations in the Pastoral Epistles and the accounts in Irenaeus should no doubt be taken with considerable caution, and such works as the Pistis Sophia, the Books of Yeu, and the hymns betray no laxity of morals, it is not improbable that this movement, like the Pauline, had an incidental

tendency to lead to lawlessness. But its eager search for knowledge and its spirit of independence, shown in numerous sects, precluded fixity of doctrine.[1]

What is true of the Gnostics, applies in many respects to all the dissenting bodies condemned as heretical. Their strength lay in a courageous protest against doctrinal stagnation, and a demand for a deeper knowledge and a holier life, their weakness in an asceticism that could not be endured, a censorious and schismatic spirit, or an exaggerated independence. It is to be regretted that the doctrinal views of men like Theodotion, Noetus, Paul of Samosata, and Sabellius should be so imperfectly known. Whether Arianism, if unchecked, would have led to a monotheism like the Jewish or Muhammadan, with an Ebionitish Christology, or developed into a polytheism more marked than the practical tritheism of the Church, is a question not easily answered. It was a significant protest against the doctrine that was destined to win the palm of victory, and it forced a definition of the "three persons" and the "two natures" bearing in itself the germs of destruction.

It is a serious misfortune that the attacks upon Christian dogma by outsiders, such as Celsus and Porphyry, have come down to us only in fragments. What has been preserved shows the truly scientific character of many of their arguments. How widely they won the approval of thoughtful men within the Church, we cannot know. But it is not likely that they would have caused such consternation among the apologists, had there been no signs of danger. The time had not arrived, however, for the acceptance of such critical results without jeopardizing more valuable possessions. The negative truths they perceived were of less importance than the positive convictions they combated. The Christian system survived, not by virtue of the errors these philosophers pointed out, but because of the larger truths they failed to see. It was not expedient for the world to go back

[1] On the significance of the Gnostic movement and the history of its gradual recognition, see *Excursus A.*

from the worship of Christ with what it held of future good to the gods of Hellas and Rome.

The Middle Ages were not a period of the upbuilding of dogma. This product of the Greek spirit working with Jewish material was completed. But the creed-making continued. Kelt and German and Slav, even though converted to Christianity, could only see the articles of faith through their own eyes. No baptismal water could wash away the thought of ages. Their Christ naturally bore many a feature borrowed from Hesu, Balder, or Bogh. The most diligent and skilful indoctrination was not able to erase the influence of foreign religious conceptions. From his heaven the new god must descend to fight his people's battles, as had the gods of their fathers. This Christ was as different from the Eternal Son of the *Symbolum Nicaenum,* as were the metaphysicians presenting their subtle arguments for or against the *homoousion* in the streets of Alexandria from the rough and valiant knights going forth, sword in hand, to conquer lands and nations for their celestial king. The claims of his vicegerent on earth were in keeping with this martial spirit.

Through this spirit the Christian nations were brought into conflict with another aggressive religion, and into contact with a civilization in some respects decidedly superior. From the great centres of Muslim learning at Toledo and Seville, Kairwan and Fostat, Baghdad and Damascus, streams of new intellectual life issued forth. Through visiting scholars and returning crusaders, through the court of Frederic II at Palermo, through the mediation of the Jews, Christian Europe became to some extent acquainted with a highly developed science of nature, a philosophy often wholly emancipated from the bondage of dogma, and a historical investigation clinging closely and critically to the facts. Perhaps the most important response to this enlivening touch was the philosophy of nominalism. It drew the mind away from the conception of universal terms as real, and bade it look upon reality as inherent in the things themselves. Classes and categories were declared to be mere

abstractions of thought; the things that can be seen and made objects of study were proclaimed to be the realities. A heaven full of imaginary objects, types and patterns, was shattered; an earth full of unobserved individual things challenged attention. If this philosophy was in a degree the fruit of the scientific spirit engendered through Muslim influence, it became even more markedly the cause of the further development of science. For historical criticism the time had not yet come. The veiled efforts of Abraham ibn Ezra, the Jewish philosopher of Toledo, proved abortive.

The danger to dogma from nominalism was only equalled by that threatening from mysticism. If Francis of Assisi, Tauler, the author of *Theologia Germanica*, and Thomas à Kempis still moved within the sphere of the accepted system, many of "the brethren of the common life" not only appealed, as Gerhard Groote had done, from patristic and scholastic authority to that of the Gospel itself, but went so far as to reject the doctrine of the Church on essential points, as in the case of the sacraments. The abandonment of external authority is the inevitable result of any deepening of man's religious life.

Erasmus and Luther, Zwingli and Calvin, all show the influence of mysticism and its tendency to undermine established doctrines. They indeed left untouched the Christ of the ecumenic creeds, and the authority of the Scriptures was made the formal principle of the reformation. But this formal principle was seriously affected by the material principle, justification by faith, which Luther applied as a standard of canonicity; and the great reformer, with his warm human heart, who dared to approach the divine without priestly mediation, found in his Christ a richer humanity. His noble independence has left in German soil a legacy of incalculable worth. Calvin, easily foremost among the reformers as an exegete, accepted the Catholic Christology, but his more literal method of interpretation, his desire to put the legislation of the Bible to a practical test in political life, his lack of faith in salvation by sacramental magic, and his broad historic outlook from the view-point of eternal

decrees blazoned the path of rational Bible study, historical criticism and social progress.

The fullest development of these tendencies was reached in the Baptist churches. Here a conscious spiritual experience, not a creed or a sacrament, was made the basis of fellowship. The supreme authority of the inner light was recognized. Absolute liberty of conscience and non-interference by civil society in matters of religion were demanded, and the principle of voluntary association was maintained. How subversive of dogma this general attitude was, is well seen in the case of Johannes Denck,[1] one of the profoundest thinkers of the sixteenth century. He argued the greater authority of the inner light, the immediate vision of truth, from the fact that only a small part of the human race had any knowledge of the Scriptures; he believed in the final salvation of all men and freely proclaimed this conviction; he rejected the piacular conception of Jesus' death and declared him to be a prophet. His views were widely adopted and he was held in highest esteem in all the churches. In 1550 sixty delegates from about forty Baptist churches in Italy, Switzerland and Austria met in Venice to settle the question whether Christ were God or man. Thrice during the meeting the Lord's Supper was celebrated. After forty days of earnest discussion an almost unanimous decision was reached against the deity of Christ, against the reality of good and evil angels, against the immortality of the godless and a place of future punishment, in favor of soul-sleeping, and against the propitiatory nature of Christ's suffering.[2] Others, like Balthasar Hubmaier, no doubt ad-

[1] Cf. especially Ludwig Keller, *Ein Apostel der Wiedertäufer*, 1882; also Richard Heath, *Anabaptism*, 1895.

[2] See copies of the records of the Inquisition published by Comba, *Rivista Christiana*, 1885, and the accounts given by Benrath, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1885, p. 20, and by Comba, *I nostri protestanti*, 1897, II, 488 ff. A popular account is given by Newman, *A History of the Baptist Churches in the United States*, 1894, p. 34 f, and a fuller statement in *A History of Antipedobaptism*, 1899. Unfortunately Newman does not quote his sources in a manner that makes it possible for the reader to verify his statements, and some of the most remark-

hered more closely to traditional lines. But there was no dogma. Liberty prevailed. It produced a gentleness and dignity of language and demeanor that contrasted agreeably with the vulgarity of speech and harshness of judgment that mar the memory of so many great men of the period. Nor can those who without a murmur suffered martyrdom at the stake or by drowning be charged with want of firm conviction. Affiliated with this radical movement were Michael Servetus, burned by Calvin for his views on the Trinity and infant baptism, and Andreas Bodenstein Carlstadt, the great literary critic.

The mighty spiritual impulses of the reformation seem to have gradually spent their force. An apparently barren orthodoxism adorned itself with Luther's name, without possessing the power of his faith; an estimate of the Bible more fictitious than ever, and a new incrustation of dogma temporarily obscured the liberalizing tendencies of Calvin's thought; the abuse of liberty at Münster cast discredit on a fair name, and scattered the precious possessions once held together in the bond of peace among many sects. Yet the apparent retrogression was probably the only way of preventing the new type of religious life from flowing back into the channels of the re-invigorated rather than thoroughly reformed Catholic church, and of gathering ethical vigor for future advances.

A vantage-ground for critical work was discovered in the mother-church in her recognition of a sifting process through a long succession of living authorities. Where Rome had not yet spoken, critics might speak. The authority of the Church, while never at variance with the true sense of the Scriptures, was above every human interpretation of them; and they might be freely examined so long as her authority was not infringed. Thus members of the Society of Jesus, like Bento Pereira and Jacques Bonfrère, felt free to suggest post-Mosaic material in the Pentateuch; and fathers of the Oratorio in Paris, like Jean Morin, Richard

able facts showing the critical insight of the Italian Baptists are entirely overshadowed or omitted.

Simon and Charles François Houbigant, went far in advance of Protestant scholars in textual and literary criticism. How circumscribed the freedom of even eminent scholars in the Reformed church was in the beginning of the seventeenth century, the history of Johannes Piscator (Fischer) shows. The often remarkably sane exegesis of the Herborn Bible found toleration only in Nassau, where heretics in mathematics, physics and astronomy also were safe.

A new conception of the universe, of incalculable significance for the destiny of dogma, developed through the discoveries of Copernicus, Brahe, Bruno, Galileo, Huyghens and Newton. In England the new science found its most generous welcome and exercised its widest influence. Its bearing on theology became manifest in the works of Thomas Hobbes and of the deists. Among these Charles Blount, John Toland and Anthony Collins probably did the greatest service. Blount pointed out the inconsistency of the Biblical cosmogony with the Copernican theory; Toland called attention to the radical differences of thought in the apostolic church; Collins proved the Maccabæan origin of the book of Daniel, and searchingly examined the supposed Messianic prophecies. A curious instance of how a new view of the world may be read into the Bible by the allegorical method to the utter extinction of dogma was presented by Thomas Woolston. The real merits of these English thinkers should not be denied. A fatal inability to explain the growth and maintenance of the Christian system except by priestcraft and deception, and a consequent acerbity of temper, degenerating into cynicism in Bolingbroke, constituted their greatest weakness, and limited their capacity to gain permanent recognition for the truths they so clearly perceived. On the other hand, its very freedom from the characteristics of deistic warfare and its profundity of thought prevented for some time David Hume's[1] contribution to religious thought from receiving an attention commensurate with its intrinsic importance. Meanwhile the

[1] *The Natural History of Religion*, 1757.

leaven of mysticism was at work. The Baptist churches in Poland were quietist and Unitarian. When they were driven out, they found refuge in Holland and in England. They helped to create the atmosphere in which Arminianism grew up. They contributed largely to the Socinian, Unitarian and Universalist movements, and paved the way for Quakerism. The latter was perhaps the most potent spiritual force of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. While the quietism of Jean de Labadie, Anna Maria van Schurmann, Madame de Guyon and Fénélon, and the pietism of Spener, Francke, Dippel, Edelmann and Zinzendorf, may ultimately have had an independent origin, not due to the missionary zeal of the Quaker, the impact of the English movement is plainly visible, and its effect on the Anglo-Saxon world was very great.[1] It was largely through the faith and patience of her Quaker saints that England learned the principle of religious toleration; it was William Penn, the Quaker, and Roger Williams, the Baptist, who established in America a still broader religious liberty.

Deism and pietism alike tended to undermine the dogmatic structure. Jean Leclerc, already affected by Spinoza's *Tractatus Religio-politicus* (1670), came under the influence of Newton, Locke and Collins, and left an impression upon the susceptible remonstrant body too deep to be removed by tardy caution. In the *Wolfenbüttler Fragmente*, published anonymously by Lessing, after the author's death, in 1774 and 1777, Hermann Samuel Reimarus, a man of vast erudition and keen insight, but somewhat lacking in delicacy and vital religious interest, revealed the influence of

[1] Cf. Bruno Bauer, *Einfluss des englischen Quäkerthums auf die deutsche Cultur*, 1878. This exceedingly thoughtful work suffers somewhat from a too violent reaction against the narrow sectarianism that twenty-five years ago characterized most church historians, whether their sect was large or small. If at times he exaggerates the influence of individual mystics, his estimate of pietism is in the main as just as it is generous. It was particularly needful at a time when theological thought began to be dominated by Ritschl, who had no eye but for the eccentricities of mysticism, and so signally failed to appreciate its ethical and religious value.

the English school. Poets like Lessing, Herder and Goethe, and philosophers like Wolf and Kant also contributed powerfully to the broadening of the religious outlook. In France, Voltaire, Rousseau, Diderot and others expounded the tenets of deism. Voltaire, who knew most intimately English life and thought, unfortunately copied some of the most objectionable features of the deistic polemics. His famous phrase, *Ecrasez l'infame!* was indeed not hurled against Christ, but against the Catholic church, and it may even appear mild in comparison with the intemperate language in which Protestant theologians were wont to indulge when speaking of this church. But there seems at times to be a malice in his satire and a lack of fairness in his judgment that could not but affect his own vision, and prevent men from accepting even the truth he offered. A deeper earnestness and a loftier purpose, though with serious defects, characterized Thomas Paine, whose "Age of Reason" did so much, on both sides of the Atlantic, to destroy the foundations of dogma.

More or less consciously pietism marched to the same goal. When "The Lord has revealed this to me," or "It seems to me," takes the place of "It is written," rationalism is unavoidable. How shall a man determine, whether a conviction in his mind is the authoritative utterance within him of a spirit not himself, or a subjective judgment reached by processes of ratiocination? When truth is no longer measured by external standards, how can reason be prevented from ultimately proclaiming its supreme authority? The transition may be watched in Nicolas Zinzendorf, in Carl Friedrich Bardt, in Johann Salomo Semler, "the father of criticism," in Johann David Michaelis. The rationalism of H. E. G. Paulus still hesitated to touch traditional views concerning authorship or to resort to mythology; it was a consistent, and therefore onesided and mistaken, effort to explain all miracles as based on actual occurrences.[1] His

[1] The greatest weakness of the rationalistic school was its lack of historic sense. It wanted to find its own ideas in the Bible. Historic objectivity is an easier virtue to-day, however, than a hundred years

pupil, W. M. L. De Wette, who applied both literary criticism and a mythical theory to the Old Testament, yearned to harmonize a living faith with a scientific method.[1] Schleiermacher drew from Herrnhut his warm piety, his conviction that "it is the heart that makes the theologian," his inclination to pour the new wine into the old bottles, and his recognition of the rights of criticism. Similarly a deep mysticism, an immense wealth of ideas, and a luminous haze of language characterized Hegel. To this trio of Berlin teachers the emancipation of religious thought in Germany is largely due. Among their disciples were C. P. W. Gramberg, Wilhelm Vatke and J. F. L. George, who first drew the outlines of the now generally accepted course of Israel's religious development; David Friedrich Strauss, whose epoch-making work[2] recognized the unhistorical character of the Fourth Gospel and the mythical element in the New Testament; Ferdinand Christian Baur, who discerned the conflict between Jewish and Pauline Christianity and the historical background in the second century for a large part of the Pauline literature; and Bruno Bauer, who sought to establish a relation of the entire Pauline literature to Rome analogous to that of the Johannine literature to Alexandria.

In the Hegelian philosophy the principle of development according to ascertainable laws was enunciated. But the laws as yet most clearly recognized by natural science were those of mechanics. Their application to the movements

ago; and the ordinary treatment of rationalism itself shows that it is by no means too abundant. Hermann Müller's articles *Zur Würdigung des Rationalismus* in *Protestantische Monatshefte*, July and August, 1901, are encouraging.

[1] The influence of Eichhorn and De Wette was felt even in America, where George R. Noyes published a critical essay on the Messianic prophecies in 1834. John G. Palfrey wrote some excellent "*Lectures on Jewish History and Antiquities*" in 1840. Theodore Parker translated and annotated De Wette's *Introduction to the Old Testament* in 1840, and Ralph Waldo Emerson, in his famous address to the Harvard Divinity School in 1838 and through his later essays, presented the best thought of the period.

[2] *Das Leben Jesu*, 1835.

of life in human society, however justifiable, could not at first escape a certain crudeness and avoid leaving the impression of artificiality. The day was fast approaching when the laws of evolution in the realm of organic life should be more distinctly[1] seen and formulated by Darwin, Huxley, Haeckel and Spencer, and the discovery fertilize every field of human research. But before it came a reaction set in. The results must be tested. Not only apologists for traditional views, but also firm believers in literary and historical criticism, addressed themselves to the task. The vigorous and uncompromising defense of tradition by Hengstenberg, Hävernick and Keil was not without effect, and the conservatism of Neander, the subtle and allegorizing exegesis of J. C. K. Hofmann, and the mystical interpretation of J. T. Beck exercised a wide influence. More important, however, was the rejection of many positions held by De Wette, Gramberg, George, Vatke and Reuss on the one hand, and Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, Strauss and Bruno Bauer on the other, by men who were their peers in independence of thought as well as in learning. Heinrich Ewald, a disciple of Eichhorn, but his superior as an Orientalist, and gifted with a finer poetic appreciation, protested against the submergence of personality in the struggle of forces and tendencies. He restored the order of "the Law and the Prophets," and threw back the Fourth Gospel into the apostolic age. August Dillmann, great as a philologist

[1] Buffon, in his *Histoire naturelle*, 1749-1804, had thrown out important suggestions, and Lamarck, in his *Philosophie zoologique*, 1809, had already formulated one of the most important laws of evolution. It is interesting to observe that in the same year a pastor in Dobbeln in Brunswick, G. Ballenstedt, published in Henke's *Museum für Religionswissenschaft*, 1809, p. 570 ff, an article entitled *Umriss einer auf Thatsachen und Naturgesetze sich gründenden Geogonie*, in which, following Spallanzani and Blumenbach, he not only affirmed a belief in spontaneous generation, but laid down a remarkable system of orderly development of life on the planet. Among the earlier forerunners none was greater than Lamarck. Herbert Spencer in some respects anticipated Darwin, but Darwin's *Origin of Species*, 1859, was epoch-making.

conscientious as an interpreter, continued the protest, in new surroundings, suspicious of "an evolution along straight lines," though yielding point after point to love of truth, and even Theodor Nöldeke, the most eminent Semitic scholar of the century, and an acute literary critic, maintained for some time, against Graf and Kuenen, the pre-exilic origin of the priestly legislation. Karl Hase leaned again, though somewhat doubtfully, on the Fourth Gospel as a historic source, and C. H. Weisse found it necessary to assume at least a post-mortem appearance of the spirit of Jesus to account for the doctrine of the resurrection. Such masters of New Testament exegesis as Theodor Keim,[1] Carl Weizsäcker, J. H. Scholten, Adolf Hilgenfeld, Otto Pfleiderer and Heinrich Holtzmann adhered indeed faithfully to all that was essential in the position of the Tübingen school. But on literary questions they surrendered many of the contentions of Baur, and opposed some of the characteristic views of Strauss and Bruno Bauer. Not seldom their deviations from Baur marked decided steps forward, as when some of them discarded the Johannine authorship of the Apocalypse. Yet this rejection of a chief corner-stone of the Tübingen structure appeared to these scholars themselves and others less significant than the fact that they deemed it possible to assign to Paul three or four more epistles than Baur had been able to do. The differences on details of criticism between the school of Ewald and the school of De Wette, between the present survivors and the founders of the Tübingen school, were of little moment in comparison with the underlying unity of method, mental attitude and even results. But the impression of a reaction was important, as it tended to increase confidence in the carefulness and integrity of Biblical scholarship and to create a more generous hospitality to critical study among theologians in different lands.[2]

[1] Keim's *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara,* 1867, is perhaps the most learned Life of Jesus that has been published. It is written in an admirable spirit.

[2] While the influence of the "rationalists" and De Wette scarcely

A significant movement, also heralded as a sign of reaction, proceeded from Albrecht Ritschl. Ritschl was fundamentally opposed to mysticism, sought to eliminate philosophy from religion (though not without the aid of Neo-Kantianism), pointed to the objective revelation of God in Christ, and insisted upon a practical transformation of individual and social life by Christian ethics. He brought James, I Peter, I John, Hebrews and Luke[1] back to the beginnings of Christian literature, caused an Essene Ebionitism to spring up after the fall of Jerusalem, and fixed a great gulf between Paul and the Gentile Christianity of the second century degraded by Greek philosophy. His system was chiefly elaborated by Herrmann; his criticism was particularly carried on by Harnack. The strength of Herrmann's contention for a Christo-centric theology lay in the feeling that a human ideal is the greatest need of the worshiper; its weakness, in the uncertainty concerning the actual life of Jesus and the ideal which it suggests, when historical criticism is admitted. Harnack, with admirable mastery of the material, examined the external evidence of the New Testament literature, rejoiced in the slender threads by which it seemed possible to hang it to its traditional authorship, made less confident use of internal criteria, and

affected any theologians in England and America except the Unitarians, that of Ewald extended to teachers of theology and representative exegetes in the most conservative Protestant denominations. It is sufficient to refer to Samuel Davidson, J. W. Colenso, Rowland Williams, Robertson Smith and T. K. Cheyne in England, Augustus Briggs and C. H. Toy in America. An influential writer closely in touch with German scholarship, yet independent, was W. R. Cassels, the long anonymous author of "Supernatural Religion." The impress of German thought may also be traced to some extent in the Scandinavian countries. But more frequently the reaction against dogma led men of genius into lonely paths. This independence may be seen in Lindgren's and Myrberg's treatment of the Old Testament, in Viktor Rydberg's Biblical criticism, in Boström's idealistic rationalism, in Pontus Wikner's realistic mysticism, and in Sören Kirkegaard's liberalism.

[1] Cf. *Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, 1882, II, p. 320.

earnestly endeavored to clear up such important matters as the early history of Gnosticism and the origin of the monarchical episcopate. His desire to vindicate the earliest possible date for the New Testament books is so manifest that his conclusions become, on this account, all the more significant. The "eye-witnesses," James and John, Peter and Jude, are once more deported into "second century exile;" interpolations on a large scale are assumed to save fragments of Pauline letters; the unhistorical character of the Fourth Gospel is fully recognized; and the story of Jesus, from virgin birth to resurrection and ascension, is emptied of its miraculous content. Harnack is quite as far removed from the theology of the ecumenic creeds as was Baur. The differences between the two critics concern matters of wholly subordinate interest. The "reaction" could not effect the rehabilitation of dogma.

In the meantime, the evolutionary hypothesis had won its way into every branch of science. If the successive strata of the earth's crust furnished external testimony to the relative age of their fossil inclusions, the discovered genetic relations of palaeontological forms supplied internal evidence as to their place in the chain of development. If, in the vastly increasing archaeological and documentary material, landmarks of priceless value were here and there set up by actual dates, the historian learned for the most part to determine chronological position by relying on the observed tendencies of life and thought. In the light of palaeontological research, it became impossible for liberally educated men to believe in the Biblical account of man's origin and nature. When the principles of criticism that had gained ascendency in other realms of historic investigation were applied to the Old Testament, the traditional authorship of its books, the accepted course of Israelitish history, Messianic prophecy, in any strict sense, and typology disappeared. Many of the conclusions reached on the basis of Hegelian philosophy found their triumphant vindication. This was not merely due to the genius and learning of such men as Kuenen and Wellhausen, Stade and Duhm, Robert-

son Smith and Cheyne. Their results were gained and won general acceptance, because the spirit of the new time demanded a rational explanation of Israel's life on the theory of evolution that had opened so many other doors. It was found that the philosophy of evolution did not ignore the element of personality. In fact, the prophets, legislators, chroniclers, sages and apocalyptic seers of Israel had never before been such living and essential factors of history. The superstition was dispelled that, in order to appreciate an author's worth, it is necessary to know his name. The merging of the personality of Hebrew patriarchs in Hebrew tribes bearing their names was more than compensated by the light thrown on a thousand years of growth in Palestine. The eclipse of the miracle rendered it possible to discover the dominancy of ethical forces. And the new estimate was introduced without serious injury to the religious sentiment. It is a significant indication of the religious vitality of the Church that in a measure she was able to adjust herself to a conception of Israel's life that demolished the very foundations of Christological dogma. The religious sense, as well as the scientific consciousness, found a deeper satisfaction in the new view than the old could afford.

But the movement could not stop at the Old Testament. Under its influence Ernest Renan, the great Orientalist, wrote his Life of Jesus.[1] This work suffers from an indiscriminate use and an insufficient critique of the sources, and it draws too freely upon a rich and artistic imagination. But its fundamental attitude is that of Strauss, and it adds a new emphasis on the physical environment and an earnest attempt to trace the complication and denouement of the tragedy of Jesus' life. The tragic element was naturally discovered in his Messianic consciousness. How, without infringement upon his humanity, this consciousness could originate and grow within him, was persuasively described by Baldensperger.[2] Fed by apocalyptic literature a Messianic hope of a highly spiritual type had devel-

[1] *Vie de Jésus*, 1863.

[2] *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*,[2] 1892.

oped in the circles whence Jesus came forth. This position is still maintained in the most modern treatment of the life of Jesus. The admirable work of Albert Réville,[1] coming from a *milieu* than which none can be more conducive to truly scientific study of religious phenomena, is sympathetic in spirit, accurate in method, and adequate in critical apparatus. But unverifiable and improbable assumptions remain. In spite of the abundant labors of Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Dillmann and Charles, the most vital questions in apocalyptic literature are still *sub judice;* and there is not a tittle of evidence that such a conception of the Messiah as the composite Parables of Enoch present was known to Jesus. That "son of man" was a Messianic title, and that Jesus used it as such a designation of himself, can no longer be maintained. When the recorded sayings of Jesus are translated back into his own Galilean dialect of the Aramaic, as they must be, the impossibility of both of these assumptions becomes evident. But with them goes the only ground on which it can be supposed that Jesus regarded himself as the Messiah. An earlier strand of apostolic tradition, as Lagarde discerned, still preserves the memory of a prophetic career averse to Messianic pretensions. The investigations of the phrase "son of man" by Eerdmans, Schmidt, Meyer, Lietzmann and Wellhausen, the searching examination of the passion week by Brandt,[2] and the incisive study of the secret of the Messiahship by Wrede[3] have tended to remove the last remnant of the traditional conception.

But the scientific instrument itself by which this change has been effected prevents the dissolution of the personality of Jesus into a symbol and a name, and points the creed-making tendency into new paths. Nothing can more convincingly prove that Christianity ultimately owes its origin to a living Galilean prophet than the preservation in the written records of a tradition radically at variance with the

[1] *Jésus de Nazareth,* 1897.

[2] *Die Evangelische Geschichte,* 1893.

[3] *Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien,* 1901.

estimate held by the authors of these biographies. This tradition cannot have been invented. Every motive for such a creation is wanting. It can only be the reflection of historic fact. Its persistence in Palestine explains the silence of Philo and Josephus. When Philo died, Hellenistic Christianity had not yet risen above the horizon. When toward the end of the first century Josephus wrote his *Antiquities*, the distinction between those Aramaic speaking Jews who looked for the return of Jesus as the Messiah and those who expected the coming of a Son of David, preserved in heaven for the time appointed, was not sufficiently marked to warrant a special mention of the former as a party or a philosophical school. The precious seed lay buried in the ground longer than has been supposed, imperceptible to eyes surveying only the salient features of Jewish life. Ritschl rightly felt that between the death of Jesus and the Pauline literature there was a period in which a less advanced type of doctrine, a somewhat modified Judaism, was proclaimed by the immediate disciples.[1] He erred, however, when he looked for this teaching to the epistles ascribed by tradition to the apostles, just as the Tübingen school was mistaken in making the Apocalypse a representative of this primitive Christianity. As yet we possess no literary document from the immediate disciples of Jesus bearing testimony to their faith. Whether any of them ever wrote a line, or the earth still holds any fragment of the first written Aramaic record, the future may reveal. Meanwhile we cannot be sufficiently grateful for the possibility of disentangling an early and reliable tradition by means of literary and historical criticism of the Greek gospels and a translation of the sayings ascribed to Jesus into the language which he spoke.

The very facts that most unmistakably show the historical character of Jesus, are at the same time precious indications of his distinctive spirit and peculiar genius. They furnish the basis for constructive work. By a judicious sifting of

[1] *Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, II, 1882, p. 320.

the material on the vantage-ground thus gained, and a careful testing of each *logion* in the closest possible restoration of its original Aramaic form, the general trend at least of the teaching of Jesus may be ascertained. In separating later accretions, not only the influence of the intellectual environment but also the reaction against it of a mighty personality, not only the organizing principles on which the emphasis falls but also the unassimilated survivals of older conceptions, must be considered. Otto Schmoller, Johannes Weiss and Wilhelm Bousset have well maintained that the kingdom of heaven must have been even to Jesus an eschatological idea: the prophet's eyes are always turned toward the future. But if the coming kingdom was conceived by him as a social order whose laws were of permanent validity, he may have regarded it as present wherever those laws were observed, and his ethics cannot be interpreted as merely provisional in view of an impending catastrophe. It is a most delicate task to determine Jesus' attitude on social questions. The temptation is very strong to cover with his authority one or another view in economic science. But it is more honest to differ than to force the interpretation. If a man believes that retaliation, warfare, usury, inordinate wealth, oath-taking and divorce are essential to the maintenance of civil society, he may see in some real or imaginary inconsistencies a support for his own philosophy, but he must not on this ground obscure or obliterate the fundamental opposition of Jesus to these things. Let him express his dissent, as Renan and Réville have done in regard to wealth. If, from a democratic standpoint, such and similar positions may appear of necessity to imply a socialistic programme, it is not justifiable to assume that the far-reaching principle of service taking the place of authority must have been thought out in all its political and economic bearings, and to throw doubt upon the famous "Render unto Caesar that which is Caesar's." In view of the presuppositions of the time, the rugged honesty of Albert Dulk's[1] criticism of Jesus for his ambition to become a king

[1] *Der Irrgang des Lebens Jesu*, 1884.

makes a more favorable impression than the defense by A. Matthes,[1] from substantially the same point of view, of his shrewdness in taking advantage of a position "in the centre of the world's history." It should be recognized that Jesus was not cognizant of the conditions of modern life, with its peculiar problems, its larger experience and observation, its social theories, and its methods of testing them. Yet there can be no question that the toiling masses of mankind, seeking a more equitable distribution of the wealth drawn from nature's bounties and produced by common labor, and a mode of existence more in harmony with the dignity of manhood, are quite right in feeling that by the substitution of the Jesus of history for the celestial King of dogma, they have won a friend whose teaching, life, and death will ever be an inspiration in the struggle for justice and for mercy.

Jesus looked forward to the kingdom of heaven. He also looked upward to the Father in heaven. This conception was not new. But he gave it a majesty and a tenderness never approached before. His thought of God manifestly came from a rich inner experience, a deep and holy mysticism. Not from books or teachers, but from immediate contemplation of reality, did he gain his marvelous assurance. As he reflected on the infinite goodness of the divine Being, he realized that neither he, nor any other man, could be called good. But he seems to have had no morbid sense of sin. His consciousness of imperfection was swallowed up in the sense of divine love. He looked into the Father's face, and they were one forever. With a conscience void of offense, he whispered *Abba!* and leaned with childlike confidence, obedience and joy upon the Unseen Arm. This attitude toward the infinite mystery in which our human life is imbedded is religion pure and undefiled. This is eternal life. To whom should we go to hear words instinct with this life but to the Prophet of Nazareth? The Christ of dogma

[1] *Das Urbild Christi,* 1897, p. 260 f. This is a thoughtful and suggestive work, written from an independent standpoint in a reverent spirit, and should not be passed by because of its somewhat artificial arrangement.

had much to give. "Of his fulness we all received, and grace for grace." But this he could not give. For he was not true man. Therefore dogma must pass away, setting the scientific instinct free to search for the historic reality, and leaving the moral and religious impulses to find a new ideal in the life of Jesus.[1]

[1] This passing of Christological dogma is but an incident in the process of evolution by which a more adequate estimate of the universe has been formed and takes the place of the corruption prevalent among the civilized nations of antiquity. The conflict between the old view of the world and the new has been described, with amplest knowledge, by Andrew D. White, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, 1896.

CHAPTER III

THE OLD TESTAMENT BASIS

The chief contributions of the Old Testament to the developing Christology of the Church were the Messianic prophecies and types discovered in its various books by late Jewish and Christian exegesis. This exegesis was intimately connected with, and largely rested upon, a peculiar conception of the world, of man's origin, nature and destiny, and of his fall and redemption. The universe was regarded as having been brought into existence through the fiat of a supra-mundane divinity. The first man was supposed to have been fashioned from clay by the hands of the deity, and the first woman to have been made of a rib taken from man. By their disobedience this couple was thought to have made the whole race subject to death, brought all their descendants into the power of the devil, and plunged them into the everlasting torments of hell. Such a complete ruin of a being made in the image of God was considered as having occasioned a divine scheme of salvation. As the utter helplessness of man's condition and the need of redemption could only become apparent in the course of his history, his depravity was allowed to increase until "the fulness of time," when the Saviour should appear. Meanwhile, however, the divine plan—so it was thought—had been gradually revealed to men, partly through the sure prophetic word, shining as a lamp in a dark place, partly through a series of divinely ordained types pointing to the coming Redeemer and his reign on earth.

According to this interpretation of the Hebrew Scriptures, Messianic prophecy furnished also a present means of salvation to those who did not live to experience its fulfilment, but, seeing it from afar, believed and were justified

by faith. Since without a knowledge of Christ man must utterly perish, this knowledge was thus mercifully supplied from the very beginning, and grew more plentiful from age to age. Like a golden thread, the story of Jesus Christ was supposed to run through every book of the Hebrew Bible, his life and death, his teaching and miracles, his resurrection and return to earth being indicated so plainly that only an obdurate heart, a blind unbelief and a dull understanding could fail to recognize even the details of the marvelous picture, while good men in every generation were brought through it to a living faith in Christ, and the apostles were enabled to find the Messiah when he finally appeared.

In a similar manner, it was supposed that a system of religious facts, experiences and practices had been gradually introduced, whose sole value lay in its esoteric meaning, its suggestion of things to come. The law of Moses was conceived of as a school-master leading men to Christ. Surrounded on all sides by adumbrations of the great reality to come, a member of the chosen people might, it was thought, by looking at the type, divine the antitype, and approaching in the right spirit the divinely appointed sign, draw near to the infinite grace itself and receive spiritual life. While it was felt by some Christian interpreters that the divine choice of a certain object or fact as a type could not be absolutely manifest until an inspired writer in the New Testament proclaimed its typical significance, it was generally held that the same spirit which revealed to the apostles what were the true types of Christ had already opened the eyes of many who were looking for the consolation of Israel to the hidden meaning of the ordinances of God.

The substance of Messianic prophecy, as understood by orthodox theologians, may be briefly summed up as follows: Ere yet man's disobedience and the fall had closed to him the gates of paradise, the protevangel was proclaimed by God himself. In the curse upon the devil, he gave the blessed promise that woman's seed, that is the Christ, would crush the serpent's head, destroy the power of Satan.[1]

[1] *Gen.*, iii, 15.

When Noah, disgraced by his son Ham, pronounced his curse upon Canaan, he united with it a promise that Japhet should dwell in the tents of Shem, thus predicting the time when the Gentiles should become fellow-heirs with Israel of the Messianic blessings.[1] Having left Ur of the Chaldees to go he knew not whither in obedience to God's command, Abraham received the assurance that in his seed, that is, the Christ, all nations should be blessed.[2] This pledge was renewed to Isaac and to Jacob. Before he passed away, Jacob, leaning on his staff, prophesied that the scepter should not turn from between the feet of Judah till Shiloh, that is the Messiah, should come.[3] Hired by Balak, king of Moab, to curse Israel, Balaam was forced in spirit to bless, and to foretell the rising out of Jacob of the bright and morning star, the Christ.[4] Having given his people the Law on Sinai, and led it to the border of the promised land, Moses predicted that the Lord should raise up from among his brethren a prophet like unto himself, thus indicating Christ's prophetic office.[5] Job, the patriarch, foresaw him as the Redeemer who, on the last day, would raise his suffering saint from the dead.[6] In Zion, King David sang many a hymn concerning his greater Son and Lord. He predicted his anointment as King, his divine generation, and his universal reign,[7] his humiliation as a man inferior to the angels,[8] his resurrection,[9] his divine strength,[10] his cry of God-forsakenness on the cross and his many sufferings,[11] his triumphant entrance into the heavenly sanctuary,[12] his voluntary assumption of human nature to offer a sacrifice better than that of bulls and calves,[13] his betrayal by Judas Iscariot,[14] his divinity and his eternal reign,[15] his ascension,[16] his seating himself on the right hand of the Father,[17] his rejection by the elders of his people.[18] Solomon, in Ps., lxxii, spoke of his celestial reign; in Prov.,

[1] *Gen.*, ix, 27. [2] *Gen.*, xvii, 3. [3] *Gen.*, xlix, 10. [4] *Num.*, xxiv, 17. [5] *Deut.*, xviii, 15; [6] xix, 25. [7] *Ps.*, ii. [8] *Ps.*, viii. [9] *Ps.*, xvi. [10] *Ps.*, xxi. [11] *Ps.*, xxii. [12] *Ps.* xxiv. [13] *Ps.*, xl. [14] *Ps.*, xli. [15] *Ps.*, xlv. [16] *Ps.*, lxviii. [17] *Ps.*, cx. [18] *Ps.*, cxviii.

viii, 22 ff., of his eternal creation; in Canticles at great length of the intimate union of Christ and his Church.

These announcements of the coming Messiah were continued by a long line of prophets. Hosea predicted the return of the Son of God from Egypt[1] and his resurrection on the third day.[2] Joel foretold the pentecostal outpouring of his Spirit upon all flesh.[3] Obadiah announced the coming of a Saviour upon Mount Zion.[4] Jonah, through his marvelous deliverance from the belly of the fish, foretokened the resurrection of Christ on the third day. Micah predicted the birth of the Messiah in Bethlehem Ephrathah.[5] Isaiah predicted the Christian dispensation and its extension from Jerusalem,[6] the virgin birth,[7] the light that should appear in Galilee,[8] the birth of the child whose name would be "Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Father of Eternity, Prince of Peace," of whose kingdom there should be no end,[9] the coming of "the shoot of the stock of Jesse and the branch out of its roots,"[10] the forerunner crying in the wilderness,[11] the suffering Servant of the Lord, offering an atoning sacrifice for many and rising from the dead to see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied,[12] the deliverer that should come to Zion and turn away transgression from Jacob,[13] and the Anointed One who, endowed with the Spirit, should perform miracles and proclaim good tidings to the poor.[14] Jeremiah described him as "the Branch"[15] and "the Lord, our righteousness,"[16] foretold the mourning over the massacred infants at Bethlehem,[17] the miraculous conception[18] and the new covenant.[19] Ezekiel prophesied the new covenant,[20] the coming of a descendant of David,[21] the appearance of "one to whom the right belongs,"[22] the reign of the greater David.[23] Daniel not only foretold the death of the Messiah,[24] but also his coming on the clouds of heaven.[25] Haggai referred to him as "the desire of all na-

[1] xi, 1. [2] vi, 2. [3] iii, 1. [4] vs. 18. [5] v, 1, 2. [6] ii, 1 ff. [7] vii, 14. [8] viii, 23. [9] ix, 5 ff. [10] xi, 1 ff. [11] xl, 3. [12] lii, 13–liii, 12. [13] lix, 20. [14] lxi, 1 ff. [15] xxiii, 5; xxxiii, 15. [16] xxiii, 6. [17] xxxi, 15. [18] xxxi, 22. [19] xxxi, 31. [20] xi, 19. [21] xvii, 22 ff. [22] xxi, 32. [23] xxxiv, 23, 24; xxxvii, 24 ff. [24] ix, 24-27. [25] vii, 13.

tions."[1] Zechariah spoke of him as "the Branch" that should be crowned,[2] the king entering Zion on an ass's colt,[3] the good shepherd who should be betrayed for thirty shekels of silver,[4] and smitten of God.[5] Finally, Malachi predicted the appearance of the forerunner, in the power and spirit of Elijah, and the coming of the Lord himself to his temple.[6]

Such was the structure of the Messianic hope found in the Old Testament. Many other features were naturally added here and there by an interpretation that regarded Christ and his Church as the nucleus of the Hebrew Scriptures. The list of supposed Messianic passages is by no means exhausted. But those mentioned are the most important, and have been most widely recognized. Old Testament Christology stands or falls with them. A recognition of their true character reveals with increasing clearness the absence of the Christ-conception in the Hebrew canon, and the late appearance of the elements out of which it grew. This insight is the result of a long and painstaking scientific labor that has had no other aim than to discover the true significance of the language used in the sources, the exact value of these sources, and the real facts of history.

The story of the Yahwe-garden in the land of Eden is a myth. Adam is not a historic personality. There is no reference to the Messiah. The constant struggle between man and beast, the toil of man, the suffering of woman, the sexual desire, the use of clothing, the godlike knowledge, yet the failure to attain perpetual existence, are explained by the myth as due to the action of a wise serpent revealing, contrary to Yahwe's intention, the magical virtue of a tree, and to Yahwe's intervention to prevent further encroachments on the prerogatives of gods. The curse upon the serpent does not contemplate any end to the conflict between men and serpents. Of the three peoples mentioned in the old song (Gen., ix, 25-27), Canaan is best known. The desire is there expressed that the Canaanites may become slaves of the nations represented by Shem and Japhet. That Shem is regarded as the people entitled to possess the

[1] *Hag.*, ii, 7. [2] iii, 8; vi, 12. [3] ix, 9. [4] xi, 12. [5] xiii, 7. [6] iii, 1.

territory and to enslave its Canaanitish inhabitants, is clear, not only from the prayer, "Bless, Yahwe, the tents of Shem!"[1] but also from the concession, "Let him (Japhet) dwell in the tents of Shem!" Whatever other tribes the author may have had in mind, there can be little doubt that he thought in the first place of Israel. His reason for choosing the term "Shem" may have been to appeal to a larger circle of kinsmen for aid or approval in the subjugation of Canaan. It is probable that Japhet, afterwards used as a designation of various peoples in Asia Minor, Greece and the Mediterranean lands, here denotes the Philistines, whose Cretan origin becomes increasingly certain. At a time when the subjection of the Canaanites seemed of utmost importance, and the tribe to which the author belonged was still willing to share the land with other invaders on condition that they took a part in crushing the earlier inhabitants, this song was first heard. There is no word in it concerning the Messiah, or the Christian dispensation.

Abraham, Isaac and Jacob are probably the local heroes of Hebron, Beersheba and Shechem. Their names seem to indicate that as such they received divine honors in these places at an earlier period. The legends told of them reflect the spirit and ideals of the early royal period. When the Canaanites had been actually subjugated, the question arose as to the justice of this deed. The right of Israel to the soil was then established by the fiction of a promise given to the mythical ancestor.[2] Conscience being satisfied, the sense of national greatness could voice itself by furnishing this ancestor also with a promise that his descendants would become such "a great and mighty nation" that other peoples seeing their glory might wish to be as blessed as they. "All nations shall be blessed," is a mistranslation. The verb has a reflexive force. It should be rendered: "All nations shall bless themselves with thy descendants." This means that

[1] So the text should probably be read. Cf. Gunkel, *Genesis*, 1901, to this passage.

[2] Cf. Schmidt, article *Covenant* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

they shall invoke upon themselves such blessings, such a marvelous prosperity, as they see Israel enjoying.

Gen. xlix, 10b, is probably a late gloss. It adds nothing to the thought of the first half of the verse except emphasis upon Judah's rightful claim to authority over subject peoples. While the original poet sang:

> "Not turns from Judah the sceptre,"
> "Nor the staff from between his feet,"

an annotator seems to have added the couplet:

> "Till that which belongs to him come,
> "And nations pay him homage."

There is no suggestion here of a Messiah taking from the tribe of Judah its kingdom.

The "star" that Balaam is represented as seeing is evidently the Judaean kingdom. The author of these prophecies lived, as is clear from the historic allusions, in the Assyrian period. He put his glorification of Judah in the mouth of a legendary heathen seer whose home tradition had not firmly fixed, and whose name was borrowed from an Edomitish king. There is no reference in the songs to the Messiah.

That Deuteronomy, though it purports to be a work of Moses, originated centuries after his time, and was not introduced in Israel, even in its simplest form, until the eighteenth year of King Josiah, or 620 B. C., is one of the most certain results of Biblical criticism. The author of Deut. xviii, 15, looked back upon a long line of prophets like unto Moses, raised up by Yahwe one after another. He did not look forward to the Messiah.

The poet by the grace of God to whom we owe the dialogues in the book of Job did not put upon his hero's lips, we may be sure, words such as Jerome, in his translation, imputes to him in xix, 25, 26. Even the Massoretic text, though unquestionably corrupt, lies no doubt nearer to the original. Only by conjecture, aided by the ancient versions and the metre, the text may be approximately re-

stored. It seems probable that the two tetrastichs (xix, 23-24, 25-26) originally read as follows:

"Would that my words were written,"
"Were in a book recorded,
"With lead and iron stylus"
"Cut in the rock forever!"

"I know he lives, my goel,
"Upon the dust he rises.
"My witness will avenge me,
"A curse will reach my foemen."[1]

God is the blood-avenger and the witness. There is no outlook into a future life. Here, as everywhere else in the book, the solution of the problem is sought on the earth, without the relief of an adjournment. There is no thought of a resurrection, or of a Messiah in the passage.

David was a poet. His lament over Saul and Jonathan proves this. But he was not a psalm-singer. The Psalter is the hymn-book of the second temple.[2] Many of its songs may have been written in the Persian and Greek periods. The bulk no doubt belongs to the Hasmonaean age, as Olshausen perceived long ago.[3] Some of the psalms would never have been regarded as Messianic had they not been treated as such by New Testament writers. Ps. viii speaks of man in general, and not of this or that individual; Ps. xvi expresses the confidence of a *chasid*, or pietist, of the Harmonaean period, that God will preserve his life; Ps. xiii is a prayer of one who has suffered much, containing no allusion to the Messiah. In Ps. xxiv, it is God himself who enters the temple, probably at its re-dedication in 165 B. C., as Duhm has suggested;[4] Ps. xl is the utterance of a

[1] The later accretions have been removed by Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, 1898, p. 169. In his article on *Job* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, he offers a different and less satisfactory restoration.

[2] This was shown with a wealth of arguments by Cheyne in his *Bampton Lectures*, 1889.

[3] *Die Psalmen*, 1853.

[4] *Die Psalmen*, 1899. Perhaps the most valuable feature of this commentary is the lucid and convincing exposition of a number of Maccabaean and Hasmonaean hymns.

soul that has learned, through the study of some prophetic book-roll, that Yahwe wants obedience, and not sacrifices; the experience of the singer in xli, 10, that even a trusted servant proves faithless, is common enough in every age and does not refer to Judas Iscariot; in Ps. lxviii, 19, a victory of Yahwe on Mount Bashan is described, and not the ascension of Christ; Ps. cxviii, 22, is a proverb applicable in many historic circumstances.

Far more natural was it that such hymns as Pss. ii, xxi, xlv, cx, and also xviii, xx, lxi, lxiii, lxviii, lxxxiv, lxxxix and cxxxii, should be regarded as Messianic. In these Psalms a "king" is mentioned, and he is sometimes called "the Anointed." Most of these cases call for nothing but an ordinary king. As long as it was thought possible that some pre-exilic songs might have been preserved in the Psalter, it was accordingly supposed that kings of Judah were meant. With the recognition of the post-exilic origin of the Psalter this became impossible. Since in some instances the king, his relations to Yahwe, his victories and his reign are described in terms that seemed too exaggerated for any earthly monarch, the conclusion was drawn that either the holy people itself, or else its coming Messiah, was intended. Closer examination, however, reveals the fact that the transcendent conception of royalty is most natural and best authenticated in the Hasmonaean period. Following Egyptian custom, the Ptolemies had assumed divine titles. The king was "born of gods," "son of Isis and Osiris," "god of god and goddess." There is no reason to suppose that emancipated aristocrats in Jerusalem hesitated to accord such titles to an Antiochus III. Even in earlier times the king had been looked upon in Israel as a god-like being; (cp. II Sam. xiv, 17, 20, where "angel" is undoubtedly a later addition, and Isa. ix, 6.) In Pss. lvii, 2, and lxxxii, 6, Pharisaic hymn-writers scornfully designate the Hasmonaean rulers as "gods." There would be no sting in this sarcasm, if they were not actually designated as such. That this was the case, is shown by Ps. xlv, where the poet laureate of one of these princes on the occasion of a

royal wedding apostrophizes the monarch: "Thy throne, O god! is forever and aye," and "O god! thy God has anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy brothers."[1] The king whose epithalamium this is does not belong to the future. In Ps. ii the anointed king on Zion is represented as proclaiming to the rebellious nations a divine decree, given on his accession to the throne, by which they were delivered to him. By this anointment the political ruler in Jerusalem becomes the "son" of Yahwe, his representative on earth, whose duty it is to secure recognition among the nations for the Lord of heaven. Without the ardent hope that the kingdom of the world would be given to the saints of the Most High, this bold conception would not have been possible. But this king is not an apocalyptic figure. He is on the field. A part of the world has already been conquered. The rest will inevitably follow. Already a generation earlier Simon was greeted by a court poet, in Ps. cx, as Yahwe's vicegerent, the new Melchizedek, ruler, though not of Davidic descent, high priest, though not of the pontifical family. As in this psalm, so in I Macc. xiv, 41, the double dignity is conferred upon Simon "for ever," which probably means that it was to be a hereditary right. That the Hasmonaean kings applied to themselves the supposed promises to David in II Sam. vii, is only natural, and may be clearly seen in Ps. lxxxix. The term "Messiah" is naturally used of the anointed priestly rulers. But although the language is occasionally strongly tinged with apocalyptic imagery, there is nowhere a reference to a future deliverer, a coming Messiah.

Solomon is not the author of any of the works ascribed to him. Ps. lxxii is a prayer for a living king. The singer

[1] All ancient witnesses to the text agree. If there is a corruption, it must have taken place at a very early time. Bruston has suggested, *Du texte primitive des Psaumes*, 1873, that an original *yihyeh*—"there shall be" was mistaken for Yahwe and this afterwards changed into Elohim. Wellhausen and Duhm have accepted this conjecture. But that so simple a reading should have been lost everywhere, and one offering such difficulties to later thought adopted, is not probable.

desires for his sovereign long life, prosperity, wide conquests, and an enduring name. There is no necessity for regarding this king as a Ptolemy. Why should not a Jewish poet have found it in his heart to wish as good things for a native ruler as for a foreign potentate? Nor is there any need of supposing verses 5-11 to be an interpolation. The description of wisdom in Prov. viii, 22-31, is generally regarded as a poetic expression of the fact that wisdom is manifest in the creation of the world. But it may be doubted whether the conception of wisdom as a divine child, conceived and born in heaven before the creation, and playing as Yahwe's nursling in the new-made world, can have sprung full-fledged from the author's fancy. It is more likely to have a mythical origin. Aramati is Ahura Mazda's child.[1] The role that Wisdom plays in this passage is most extraordinary. There is no suggestion of an "eternal generation," and no connection with the Messianic idea. Canticles is neither an allegory of Christ's love for his church, nor a drama exhibiting the steadfast affection of a country maiden for her shepherd lover amid the fascinations of King Solomon's harem, nor yet a description of wedded love for a didactic purpose, but simply a string of love lyrics portraying the strongest of human passions.[2]

Hosea spoke of Israel as returning from Egypt,[3] and rebuked the foolish confidence that looked for a recovery "in two or three days" from the serious ills of the nation.[4] The book of Joel probably was written in the third century.

[1] Cf. C. P. Tiele, *Geschiedenis van den godsdienst in de oudheid*, II, 1, 1895, p. 138, and E. Stave, *Ueber den Einfluss des Parsismus auf das Judentum*, 1898, p. 206; Cheyne, *Semitic Studies*, 1897, p. 112, thought of Persian influence; Beer, in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1899, p. 330, particularly of Vahu Mano. Aramati seems to the present writer more likely to be the original.

[2] Cf. Schmidt, *The Messages of the Poets* in the series on *The Messages of the Bible*, edited by Sanders and Kent, and his article '*Canticles*' in the *New International Encyclopaedia*, 1902-1904.

[3] XI, 1.

[4] VI, 2.

The author expected that the signs of the coming catastrophe would be so numerous as to fill the minds of young and old in Israel with prophetic premonitions. In a post-exilic appendix to Amos a copyist or annotator has expressed the hope that the Davidic dynasty, fallen to the ground as a tent, may be established again. He no doubt thought of some surviving member of the royal family as the means of raising the prostrate tent. Obadiah declares that "conquerors shall go up from Mount Zion to judge Mount Esau." The words occur in what is probably an addition in the Hasmonaean age to a prophecy dating itself from the Persian period. The marvel of the book of Jonah is not the story of the fish, which is neither possible in itself nor in any way suggestive of the resurrection, but its quaint humor and its warm human sympathy. Micah iv-vii forms an appendix presenting a marked similarity to Zech. ix-xiv, and possibly is a product of the second century. The author looks for vengeance upon the heathen oppressors and restoration of the kingdom, not to nobles and men of royal blood in the capital, but to the country. From little Beth Ephrathah the great ruler of Israel will come forth as of yore. Is it David himself who will return to earth, or some descendant of his living at what was supposed to be the old family residence who will come forth to meet the present emergency, or a man like David who will step to the front from some obscure corner of Judaea? The literal interpretation is not impossible. If Elijah, Jeremiah, or any one of the prophets, as it would seem from Matth. xvi, 14, might be expected to return to earth, why not David? Yet it is perhaps more probable that the writer looked for a new David, and his eyes may already have descried a new Beth Ephrathah in little Modein, the cradle of the Hasmonaean princes. Micah v, 2, is an interpolation, not necessarily dependent on Isa. vii, 14.

There is no reference to the Messiah in Isaiah ii, 1 ff. This prophet did not predict in vii, 14 ff. that a virgin would bear a child, and that the child would be the Messiah. The word translated "virgin" really means "young woman,"

married or unmarried. The sign consists in this, that a woman pregnant at the time the prophet spoke would, when she had borne her son, call him Immanuel. So quickly would the much feared Syro-Ephraimitic coalition collapse, that in less than a year a mother would call her new born child "With-us-is-God," in characteristic forgetfulness of the fatal weakness within, and the more formidable foe looming up in the background. This enemy would soon cover Judah, as well as Damascus and Israel, and make it a wilderness where a surviving remnant might learn to choose the good and reject the evil. And this should be a warning sign to dynasty and people. There is not a word in the text about a virgin or a Messiah.[1] That Isa. ix, 1 ff. and xi, 1 ff. are not the work of the great pre-exilic prophet has been recognized by Stade,[2] Hackmann,[3] Cheyne,[4] Volz[5] and Marti.[6] These passages presuppose the fall of the dynasty, the exile, and the changed attitude of Yahwe to his people. It is evident that the joyous confidence these poems breathe is occasioned by the birth of a son in the Davidic family under especially favorable political circumstances. As the background is clearly the exile, Sellin[7] has thought of the birth of Zerubbabel, which presumably took place at the time when the destruction of the Babylonian empire was threatened by the advancing Persians. But in Isa. xl-xlviii, written at that period, Yahwe has no king but Cyrus. It, therefore, seems more probable that it was the elevation of Jehoiachin from his dungeon, his reinstatement in the honors at court belonging to his rank, and the birth of his son, Sin-apal-uzur (or Sheshbazzar), the later governor of Judaea (ca. 561 B. C.), that inspired these hopes. The

[1] Cf. especially F. C. Porter, *A Suggestion regarding Isaiah's Immanuel* in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1895, p. 19 ff., and articles *Immanuel* and *Isaiah* by Cheyne in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.
[2] *Geschichte Israels*, I, 1885, p. 596.
[3] *Die Zukunftserwartung des Jesaia*, Göttingen, 1893, p. 130 ff.
[4] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 1895, p. 44 ff.
[5] *Die Vorexilische Yahweprophetie und der Messias*, 1897, p. 57 ff.
[6] *Das Buch Isaia*, 1900, p. 95.
[7] *Serubbabel*, 1898, p. 37.

voices that the great prophet of the exile hears ordering the way to be prepared for Yahwe's return to Jerusalem are evidently those of celestial agents entrusted with the transformation of historic conditions to this end. Although many an individual sufferer must have furnished the characteristic features of the Servant of Yahwe in Isa. xl-lv, it can scarcely be subject to serious doubt that this figure represents the people of Israel, whose patient endurance of evil in the exile is felt to have a redemptive value, and whose reorganized national life, it is hoped, will bring the knowledge of the only living God to the other nations of the earth.[1] The famous section, lii, 13-liii, 12, is retrospective and philosophical. It does not predict a coming redeemer. It is Yahwe himself who comes to Zion in Isa. lix, 20, and in lxi, 1 ff. the prophet introduces himself as clothed with the spirit of Yahwe to bring the glad tidings of liberty to his poor compatriots. Nowhere in the book of Isaiah is there a prediction of the coming in the future of a person designated as the Messiah.

The author of Jer. xxiii, 5 ff., emphasizes the righteous character and royal dignity of the "Shoot" to be raised to David, whose name will be Jozedek.[2] As Geiger recognized long ago, the writer lived in the Hasmonaean period. The name possibly contains a hint of the pontifical succession; the Hasmonaeans were naturally regarded as the successors of David; the royal title apparently is still a hope. In Jer. xxxiii, 14-26, a late fragment not yet found in the copy used by the earliest Greek version, the writer evidently looks upon the Hasmonaean princes and high-priests as the legitimate successors of the Davidic dynasty and the Aaronid family. He rebukes the people that look upon these families as having been "rejected," coming to their end with Zedekiah and Onias. To his way of thinking, the promise to David is manifestly being fulfilled in the present dynasty, and there will always be a king sitting on the

[1] Cf. especially Budde, *Die sogenannten Ebed-Yahwe-Lieder*, 1900.

[2] R. V. "The *Lord* is our righteousness;" the Greek version has Jozedek.

throne of David, and guaranteeing the continuance of the priesthood. The little book, Jer. xxx, xxxi, is probably a product of the first decades of the fifth century, when the Graeco-Persian conflict stirred new hopes of independence in Judaea.[1] Rachel's lament over her children as dead, and the reward for her tender care in their return from captivity, have nothing to do with the story of the massacre of infants in Bethlehem. Her tomb was at Ramah (1 Sam. x, 2), and her children were Joseph and Benjamin and their descendants. "*Foemina circumdabit virum,*" Jer. xxxi, 22, continues to be to Roman Catholic theology as important, as a Messianic prophecy, as "*Ecce virgo concipiet,*" Isa. vii, 14, has until recent times been to Protestant theology. That "a woman surrounds a man" is understood to mean that she carries within her a male child. But since this would be a common occurrence, and not a miracle, the "woman" must be the Virgin Mary, the "man" Jesus, and the "new thing" her pregnant condition without the aid of a man. The passage should probably be read and rendered, "I will create a new thing—men will walk about in a redeemed land."[2] The establishment of national independence and prosperity, revealing Yahwe's pardoning grace and awakening a willingness to obey his law, is the new arrangement that the prophet yearns for (xxxi, 31). Ez. xi, 19, speaks of willingness to obey Yahwe's commandments, and not of the Christian dispensation. The "lofty top of the cedar" (Ez. xvii, 22), like the "one who has the right" to the ruined city of Jerusalem (xxi, 32), is evidently Jehoiachin. Ez. xxxiv, 23, 24, seems to be an interpolation breaking the context and at variance with its thought. The same hand has probably introduced "my servant David" in Ez. xxxvii, 24, 25. Whether the annotator used this name simply as an appellative, or actually had in mind the historical David, he appears to have wished that his people might have a king like David. His ideal was in the past.

[1] Cf. Schmidt, article *Jeremiah* (*the Book*) in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, and *The Book of Jeremiah* in the *New World*, December, 1900.

[2] Schmidt, *l. c.*

The book of Daniel was written at the time of the Maccabaean uprising (ca. 165 B. C.), as is now universally admitted. It never speaks of the Messiah. The being "like a man" that appears on the clouds of heaven is the celestial representative of Israel. By many interpreters it is held to be a symbol of the humane régime characteristic of the new world power. More probably it is here, as elsewhere, an angel, and in that case undoubtedly the angel Michael, Israel's celestial patron.[1] The "anointed prince," Dan. ix, 25, is probably Joshua ben Jozadak, with whom the high-priestly office begins, and the "anointed," who is "cut off," *i. e.*, removed from his place, is either Jochanan-Onias III, possibly the founder of the temple at Leontopolis,[2] or Joshua-Jason, with whom the legitimate line comes to its end. Haggai does not speak of a person at all in ii, 7, but of precious gems as being brought into the temple. If the references to the "branch" in Zech. iii, 8, vi, 12, are original,[3] the Davidic descendant Zerubbabel is meant, whose coronation as king Zechariah expected. The additions to the book (chs. ix-xiv), made in the second century, allude to some of the rulers of the people immediately before the Maccabaean revolt. The shepherd who is no longer willing to feed the flock, lays down his office, demands payment, receives the inadequate sum of thirty shekels, and deposits these in the temple treasury, may well be Hyrcanus, the son of Tobias, as Wellhausen[4] has suggested; and the wicked shepherd who stands so near to Yahwe, yet is slain by him, may be Menelaus. The pious and victorious ruler who enters Zion in triumph, and leads the sons of Judah against

[1] Cf. Schmidt, *The "Son of Man" in the Book of Daniel* in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* 1900, II, p. 22 ff, and Julius Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums,* 1902, p. 55 ff.

[2] Cf. Hugo Willrich, *Juden und Griechen vor der Makkabäischen Erhebung,* 1895; Wellhausen, *Gött gel. Anzeigen,* 1895, p. 951 ff; *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte,*[3] 1897, p. 244 f.

[3] F. E. Peiser, *Zu Zakharia* in *Orientalistische Litteratur-Zeitung,* 15 Aug., 1901, col. 313, and Duhm, *Das Buch Jeremia,* 1901, p. 181 f, express grave doubts.

[4] *Die kleinen Propheten,* 1898, p. 196.

the sons of Greece, is probably one of the Hasmonaeans. It is Yahwe himself, and not the Messiah, whom Malachi describes as entering his temple to purge the sons of Levi, that they may offer proper sacrifices; and it is the real Elijah, who was carried away alive from the earth, that he looks for to heal the internal dissensions and to render it possible for Yahwe to dwell in the temple.

The Hebrew Bible contains no prophecy of the appearance upon earth of such a personality as Jesus of Nazareth seems to have been. Nor does it anywhere predict the coming of such a being as the Messiah of Jewish thought was in the Roman period. The term "Messiah," or "Yahwe's Messiah," is used as a designation of kings, high-priests, and priestly rulers, who have actually been invested with their office by anointment. No member of the old royal family, around whom political hopes clustered in the Chaldaean and Persian periods, was called "the Messiah." As a designation of a coming deliverer, this term is not found in the Hebrew canon. No passage written while kings ruled in Jerusalem and Samaria even alludes to any future monarch. When the long-lived dynasty of the Isaidae had fallen, it was but natural that the hope of national independence should center on some descendant of this distinguished family. The theocratic interests of the priesthood tended to check such political aspirations. The Maccabaean insurrection started among country priests from religious motives. Through these inspired heroes the faithful expected the world to be conquered. Patriotic souls, impressed with Israel's moral and religious superiority, watched the Hasmonaean restoration of the Davidic kingdom with a sense of manifest destiny. Out of this eschatological mood the Messianic hope in its strictest sense was born, when the Roman eagles had swooped down upon the land. This mood had found expression, since the exile, in many an eager look into the future. It is an abuse of the term "Messianic," however, to apply it to expressions of hope for deliverance from oppression, victory over enemies, great changes in the world, or a good time to come, where

these contain no allusion whatever to a Messiah. This is only a source of confusion. Those who recognize that there is no Christology of the Old Testament would better avoid a term properly understood as indicating that a passage refers to Christ and his kingdom.

Although these utterances of poets and seers in Israel do not present the life and character of Jesus, and must be misinterpreted to yield prophecies even of the Messiah his contemporaries expected, their value is very great. They breathe the atmosphere of hope. It is not the bracing air of the great, sad prophets of doom who were before the exile. But men live by it. It matters little that the star of Jacob sank in blood, that Heldai's crown[1] never adorned Zerubbabel's brow, that no son of David ever crushed the nations as worthless vessels. As a fact of history, as a lesson for the race, it was important that this people should see its visions, dream its dreams, and rise from repeated disenchantments to new flights of hope.

A type is a stamp that bears the effigy to be impressed upon something, *e. g.*, a coin, or, by derivation, the effigy itself in the stamp. The impression in the coin is the antitype. Metaphorically, a type is any object containing an image, that is an analogy, by which it is fitted to represent, by the operation of the mind, another object. The type contributes nothing to the antitype. It only shadows forth the outlines of the object represented. It suggests it. It is a sign. But it differs from a sacrament by being transitory in its nature, not permanent, a sign of future, not of present, grace.

There are different classes of types. They may be divided into the following categories: I, Typical Sacraments; II, Typical Miracles; III, Typical Persons; IV, Typical Sacrifices; V, Typical Ablutions; VI, Typical instruments; VII, Typical Places; VIII, Typical Festivals; IX, Typical Visions; X, Typical Enemies.[2]

[1] *Zech.*, VI, 10, 11.

[2] This classification has been taken from the great work of Anton Hulsius, *Nucleus Prophetiae*, Leiden, 1683. The illustrations of each

The first type, like the first prophecy, was given to man in the garden of Eden. The tree of life was a sacramental type. Not the fruit itself, but the faith that expressed itself in the act of eating it had the power of giving eternal life; just as the fruit of the forbidden tree had no virtue to bestow knowledge of good and evil aside from the disobedience shown in eating it. After the fall, the first typical sacrament instituted was circumcision.[1] This sign of the covenant was a seal of Abraham's justification by faith,[2] and typified baptism, the sign of the new covenant. Similarly, the paschal lamb[3] was a type of Christ[4] appropriated in the eucharist.[5] Miracles, like the deliverance of Noah from the flood[6] and the Israelites from the Red Sea,[7] and the supply of manna from heaven,[8] and water from the rock[9] were also types of the Christian sacraments.[10]

Adam, the man of earth, was a type of Christ, the man from heaven.[11] Abraham, who looked for the city that hath the foundations, was a type of the militant and aspiring church.[12] Sarah typified the celestial Jerusalem, Hagar the terrestrial, Isaac all believers in Christ.[13] Melchizedek, the priest-king "without genealogy," who blessed Abraham and received tithes from him, was a type of the eternal Son of God.[14] Jacob and Esau typified the elect and the non-

class have also been largely drawn from this source. There is no better guide. This Leiden professor was a man of profound erudition and remarkable keenness of judgment, thoroughly familiar with ancient and modern Jewish interpretations and not affected by critical thought. The value of his work was recognized by Hengstenberg, who was greatly indebted to it. Fairbairn's book *Typology of Scripture* (6th ed. 1880), is far less comprehensive and satisfactory than that of Hulsius as a statement of orthodox doctrine, defends it with less ingenuity and acuteness, and is not a whit more critical. There is no modern work through which a student can readily learn what has become of typology, what was its fatal error, and what was the truth that gave it such a power. Yet it is intrinsically quite as important as "Messianic prophecy."

[1] *Gen.*, xvii. [2] *Rom.*, iv, 11. [3] *Ex.*, xii. [4] II *Cor.*, v, 7. [5] *John*, vi, 53. [6] *Gen.*, vii. [7] *Ex.*, xiv, 21 ff. [8] *Ex.*, xvi. [9] *Ex.*, xvii. [10] I *Pet.*, iii, 17; I *Cor.*, x, 1-4. [11] I *Cor.*, xv, 45-49. [12] *Heb.*, xi, 10. [13] *Gal.*, iv, 26 ff. [14] *Heb.*, vii, 1 ff.

elect.[1] Moses, as the mediator of a covenant, was a type of Christ.[2] Priests, prophets and kings were types of Christ and his people.

Already Abel's sacrifice, acceptable because bloody, piacular and offered in faith, was a type of Christ's atoning death.[3] Even more adequately was this death foreshadowed in Gen. xxii, where Abraham undertakes to offer his only-begotten son. The sacrificial system ordained by God through Moses, by constantly emphasizing the thought that without the shedding of blood there could be no forgiveness of sins, pointed typically to the only offering whose blood could really atone for sin.[4] The regulations concerning the animals to be offered and the time and manner of their presentation prefigured the perfection of Christ's sacrifice. The ablutions prescribed in the law were types of the cleansing from impurity in the blood of Christ, accomplished in the new covenant through the Holy Spirit by means of baptism. The ark of the covenant, the altar and the ephod all were types of Christ, his sacrifice, and his righteousness in which the believer is clothed.

The heavenly temple in which Christ presented his sacrifice[5] was the antitype of tabernacle, temple and asylum. The sacred seasons ordained by Moses were types of the spiritual blessings in Christ, and also of the sacred seasons of Christendom. Thus the Jewish sabbath on the seventh day prefigured the Christian sabbath on the day of Christ's resurrection, the Passover, the Easter festival, and the Feast of Weeks, the Pentecost celebrating the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Besides visions concerning the future of their own people, the prophets were also given visions in which the church universal and invisible was typically set forth. In such cases the angel of the covenant, *i. e.*, the pre-existent Christ himself, appeared and presented his church under the figure of an acceptable offering,[6] angels ascending on a ladder,[7] a

[1] *Rom.*, ix, 11. [2] *Gal.*, iii, 19. [3] *Heb.*, xii, 24. [4] *Heb.*, ix, 13, 14. [5] *Heb.*, ix, 24. [6] *Gen.*, xv. [7] *Gen.*, xxviii.

bush burning yet never consumed,[1] or a temple.[2] The great enemy of Christ and his church, the devil, was typified by Pharaoh, Nebuchadnezzar, and Antiochus Epiphanes.

Such were the types generally recognized by Protestant scholars before modern criticism began to cast discredit on typology. Catholic theologians would have included many more, and given to some a different interpretation. The critical study of the Hebrew Scriptures has eliminated these types. Messianic prophecy still figures in recent works on the religion of Israel, though the term "Messianic" no longer conveys its old meaning; but one now looks in vain for a single word on the subject of typology. We shall find abundant reason, however, when our survey of the field is concluded, to recognize beneath all that may have seemed merely fanciful or fantastic an element of reality. The successive cycles of experience, as reflected in history, are not unrelated, they have their similarities and correspondences in their common relation to the unchanging facts of nature and of life.

No tree of life ever grew on earth. It offered its fruits of immortality only in the mythical gardens of the gods. Circumcision was not a custom peculiar to the Jews. It was practised by Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites, Canaanites, Egyptians, Midianites and numerous other peoples.[3] Originally it was a sacrifice of holy blood to the tribal deity on entering the cult-community at the age of puberty, possibly regarded as an abbreviated phallic sac-

[1] *Ex.*, iii. [2] *Ezek.*, xl, ff.

[3] Cf. *Jer.*, ix, 25; Herodotus, ii, 36; Philo, ii, 210, ed. Mangey; Diod, Sic., iii, 31; Strabo, xvii, 824; Ploss, *Das Kind in Brauch und Sitte der Völker*,[2] 1882, I, 842 f.; article *Circumcision* by Benzinger in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. In regard to Egypt it is of interest to notice that the man represented on a plaque now in the Louvre, published by Heuzey in *Bulletin de correspondence hellenique*, 1892, p. 307 f. and pl. I, as being gored by a bull, is manifestly circumcised. That he is an Egyptian and likely to have lived in the days before Mena, has been shown by Georg Steindorff in *Aegyptiaca, Festschrift für Georg Ebers*, 1897, p. 128 ff. But circumcision is not likely to have been a novelty in the world even in the sixth millennium B. C.

rifice.[1] Later it was transferred to infancy as a dedicatory rite. In the New Testament it is not a type of baptism, but of the removal of a carnal disposition. Unquestionably, baptism, in its development from the immersion of adults to the sprinkling of infants, shows a marked similarity to circumcision. But the religious bath has a different origin and significance; and the later transformation of the rite to adapt it to the same purpose as circumcision is wholly foreign to the New Testament where the antitype should appear. The Pesach, or Leap Feast, as it was called, probably because of the gamboling of the young animals at the time when firstlings were offered to Yahwe, gradually became a memorial of the deliverance from Egypt. No Israelite could have thought of the Messiah in connection with the paschal lamb. It was the death of Jesus and the supposed reference to him in Isa. liii, 7, that led to this remarkable conception. The idea of a suffering Messiah, with which even the disciples of Jesus are entirely unfamiliar, does not appear in Rabbinic writings until centuries later. If the eucharist is suggested in John vi, 53, the idea of a material appropriation of Christ therein is clearly rejected by the assertion: "The flesh profiteth nothing, the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit and are life," vi, 63.[2]

The story of the deluge is a myth of Babylonian origin, ultimately founded on a constantly recurring natural phenomenon.[3] The crossing of the Red Sea by aid of a miracle, the manna falling down from heaven, and the water issuing from a rock that, in the last version, moves along with the Israelites through the desert,[4] belong to legendary lore. That the development of such folk-tales should have been divinely intended to prefigure the services rendered by

[1] Cf. Schmidt, article *Circumcision* in the *New International Encyclopedia*, 1902.

[2] Cf. Schmidt, *The Character of Christ's Last Meal* in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1892, p. 20.

[3] Cf. Hermann Usener, *Die Sintfluthsagen*, 1899; P. Jensen, *Die Kosmologie der Babylonier*, 1890, p. 365 ff.

[4] I *Cor.*, x, 1-4.

Jesus to the world, or the fictitious values ascribed to ecclesiastical rites, is difficult to believe.

Adam is not a historic personality. Abram, the numen of Hebron, and his consort and sister Sarah[1] are not likely to have walked upon the earth as human beings. Even in the early legends, Abraham does not look for a celestial city, and Sarah's character is not suggestive of a heavenly Jerusalem. Hagar, in the legend a Muzrite slave, in reality seems to have been an Arabian tribe.[2] Before an allegorizing interpretation capable of finding any desired meaning in any text had come into vogue, no person would have thought of seeing in this figure a mountain in Arabia,[3] or a religious community in bondage to the letter. Isaac, the benignantly smiling El of Beersheba, or the characterless hero offered by his father, could not have led men in Israel to think of the Messiah. The name Melchizedek, signifying "the god Zedek is my king," may have formed a part of the earlier stratum in Gen. xiv; the role Melchizedek plays is generally recognized as one of the latest midrashic creations in the Hebrew Bible. That a king is also a priest, is a common occurrence in history, and that a foreign king's pedigree is unknown, cannot be deemed strange. But when Simon was proclaimed high-priest and prince in 141 B. C., a poet was glad to discover a precedent in Melchizedek's case for a divinely recognized pontificate and royalty outside of the Aaronid and Davidic families, Ps. cx. Not until the author of Hebrews felt the necessity of vindicating for Jesus the right of exercising priestly functions, is it likely that any one dreamed of regarding the fact that Melchizedek's parentage was not mentioned as an indication

[1] In Babylonia, Ishtar is also called *sharratu*, sometimes sister, sometimes daughter, of Sin.

[2] In *Aegyptiaca, Festschrift für Georg Ebers*, 1897, p. 25 ff., Hommel gives an account of a list of hierodules from different parts of Arabia and neighboring countries found among Glaser's inscriptions. Some of the women come from Hagar. Winckler compares the Hagarites of I *Chron.*, v, 10, 19, 20, *Musri, Meluhha, Main* 1898, p. 51, in *Mitteiungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft.*

[3] *Gal.* iv, 25.

of the pre-existence of the Son of God, or found in the priest-king of Salem an intimation of the character and work of the ascended Christ. Jacob and Esau are the eponymous heroes of the two nations, Israel and Edom. That Yahwe of his own free grace had chosen Israel was the corollary drawn by the author of Isa. xl-xlviii from his conviction that the only living God, the Maker of heaven and earth, was none other than the God of his fathers. He hurled from Yahwe's presence the gods of the nations as lifeless statues without making his tribal god large enough to fill the vacant places. From this error a certain form of the doctrine of election suffers. It does not shadow forth the larger truth that Jesus touched. The accounts that have come down to us of the Sinaitic covenant are centuries later than the time of Moses, and cannot be used as historic documents.[1] Priests, prophets and kings were not peculiar to Israel. Those pre-exilic prophets whose moral earnestness made the richest contribution to the religious life of the nation had indeed much in common with the Jesus of history, but for this very reason were less suggestive of the Christ they have been supposed to typify.

Sacrifices are common to all peoples. Whether they are preponderatingly animal or vegetable, depends to some extent upon the climate, and even more upon social conditions. Cain's offering (Gen. iv, 3) is no doubt spurned because of its character, but this character is determined by a peculiar mode of life. The Kenites had settled down to agricultural life, and the offerings brought to their Yahwe sanctuaries consisted of vegetables. On the other hand, the destroyed tribe Abel followed the nomadic life, and brought to Yahwe, as did the patriarchs, the firstlings of their flocks. But if this tribe was crowded out of existence by the Kenites, they were forced themselves from their beloved shrines into the steppe, without even recognized pasture-grounds, and would have been exterminated but

[1] Schmidt, article *Covenant* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

for the Yahwe sign they bore, probably circumcision.[1] There is nothing in this story that would have led a Jewish reader to think of the Messiah.

The story of Abraham's trial is evidently told to show both the value of human sacrifices and the legitimacy of animal substitutes for them. The first-born, whether of man or beast, belongs to Yahwe. They were once sacrificed before the custom of redeeming the human offspring developed. No sacrifice could be more precious, no religious faith perfect that would be unwilling to render it. Yet Yahwe graciously accepts the will for the deed and is satisfied with a ram as a substitute. In this case, the human sacrifice is manifestly not intended as an atonement for sin, but only as a voluntary offering.

In the earlier parts of the sacrificial legislation, all of post-Mosaic origin, the centre of the cult is the sacrificial meal, while in the later portions, dating from the Persian period, the emphasis lies on the atonement. By this is meant the restoration of the ability to participate in the cult after a forfeiture of this privilege by sin. The "sin" does not always imply moral obliquity, and a changed moral attitude is not required for the effectiveness of the sacrifice. An awakening scepticism might question whether the blood of bulls and goats could really remove sin, but neither the law nor the temple practice suggested a doubt on this score. Those who believed the divine assurance that, if they offered a certain sacrifice, their sin would be forgiven, had no right to look upon it with misgivings, or occasion to desire a better sacrifice. If animal sacrifices were divinely ordained for the removal of sin, the apostolic premise is false. If the blood of bulls cannot take away sin, such sacrifices cannot have been divinely ordained for that purpose. If they were ordained, not to take away sin, but to make men conscious

[1] It is the merit of Stade to have suggested the true interpretation of this story, *Das Kainszeichen* in *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentische Wissenschaft*, 1894, p. 250. He thinks of a sign on the forehead. Circumscision, which seems to have been practised with great zeal among the Midianities, is more likely to be the sign.

of their inability to do so and thereby to point to a more valuable sacrifice, the avowed purpose is deceptive, and the real one concealed. Rather than pointing forward to a divinely-demanded sacrifice of an innocent human being as a propitiation for the guilty, the institution of animal offerings must have led thoughtful minds to look back with gratitude to the abolition of human sacrifices.

Ablutions, in Israel as among other nations, served the purpose of washing away the contagious sanctity communicated by touching tabued objects, such as articles used in the cult, dead bodies (the earthly habitat of beings that have joined the Elohim-circle), lepers (smitten of God), or impurity as, in many instances, it was later felt to be. The lustrations out of which baptism grew no doubt had the same origin.[1] But it is not likely that any Hebrew who washed himself after touching a corpse was by this act caused to think either of the coming Christ or of Christian baptism.

Sacred chests were used in the worship of many gods. The two stones, supposed to contain a decalogue not written until long after the ark had finally disappeared, were probably none else than the oracle-stones Urim and Thummim[2] that were used like the seven arrows of Hubal in Mecca. All gods had altars. The ephod was originally

[1] Schneckenburger thought it probable that even the baptism of John was a self-lustration, *Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselyten-Taufe*, 1828, p. 92 f. Brandt is of the opinion that John set the example of frequent self-immersions and hence received the name of "Baptist," *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893, p. 45 ff. Brandt, like Schneckenburger, assumes that the baptism of proselytes is later than the time of John. Arrian's statement, *Disputatio Epicteti* i, 9, which Schneckenburger wrongly sought to invalidate, is probably our earliest testimony. It is good only for the middle of the second century. It is likely that proselyte baptism was nothing but the first sacred bath enjoined upon a convert in earlier times, and would not differ in character from any other lustration.

[2] Cf. Muss-Arnolt, *The Urim and Thummim, Am. Journ. of Semitic Languages*, July, 1900, p. 1 ff.

in Israel a molten image of Yahwe.[1] Gideon's ephod at Ophrah was an idol made of seventeen hundred shekels of gold.[2] Sacred stones, trees, fountains, mountain tops, artificial mounds, houses and cities are not peculiar to Israel, or to the Semitic nations. They are found in every race and nation. The tabernacle in the wilderness is evidently a work of imagination copied from the Solomonic temple. This temple itself was built upon Phoenician models by Tyrian architects and workmen. From first to last this royal sanctuary seems to have been the home of other gods beside Yahwe. Zerubbabel's temple, though smaller, was made more glorious by a purer cult. Yet many felt that Yahwe had never come to reside in this temple.[3] Herod built temples to many gods, following more or less his own taste. The only sanctuary declared to have been built according to the heavenly pattern probably never existed except "on paper."[4] The cities of refuge were all old sanctuaries where the old gods in one form or another continued to be worshiped, and safety was sought by murderers at the horns of the altars.

Where gods are worshiped, there are sacred days. There are days dedicated to solar, lunar and astral deities; there are days when the lords of the harvest are praised for their

[1] Cf. Castelli, *Storia degl' Israeliti,* 1888, ii, p. 457; G. F. Moore, *Ephod* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

[2] *Judges,* viii, 27.

[3] So for instance "*Malachi,*" iii, 1.

[4] W. Shaw Caldecott in *The Tabernacle,* London, 1904, has attempted to prove that this pattern existed before Solomon's temple by the remarkable ruin called *Ramet el Khalil,* north of Hebron, which he regards as a sacred enclosure made "to screen an altar, as the hangings of the tabernacle courts screened its altar from curious and irreverent eyes," and seeks to identify these "monolithic (*sic!*) stone walls" as the Ramah of Samuel. The identification is improbable, but the suggestion as to its original purpose deserves consideration. It is impossible to examine this curious structure without being impressed by its unique character and high antiquity. It is difficult to believe that it was ever higher than it is. Only excavations can determine its depth. It has no similarity to the sacred enclosures of the Negeb examined by the present writer.

bounties. Of lunar origin are the festivals of the new moon and the sabbath, celebrating the appearance of the moon-god and the chief incidents of his course. The new moons were no doubt already observed in Arabia by the clans, afterwards forming a part of Israel, that occasionally worshiped at the mountain-shrine of the moon-god Sin (Sinai). Another survival from the nomadic period was probably the Passover, or Leap Feast,[1] when the first-born of man and beast were offered. If Yahwe cannot have these offerings in the wilderness, an early legend tells us, he will make good his loss by slaying all the first-born of man and beast in Egypt.[2] The three great annual feasts of Unleavened Bread, of Weeks, and of Booths, had originally a purely agrarian character, celebrating the ingathering of barley and wheat in the spring, and the vintage in the autumn. Gradually they were transformed into memorials of important events. It is not probable that any Hebrew ever connected with any of these feasts the thought of deliverance from sin through the atoning death of a coming Messiah. Still less were the festivals of the Christian year suggested by them. Among the early Christians there were those who looked upon all sacred days, including the sabbaths, as carnal ordinances no longer to be observed in the new dispensation.[3] The New Testament furnishes no intimation yet of an intention to substitute the first day of the week for the seventh as a sabbath, but it was quite natural that the "venerable day of the Sun," like the Saturnalia and other Roman festivals, should in course of time be adopted for Christian use.

Visions were seen by men and women in Israel as in other nations. These were perhaps for the most part genuine ecstatic experiences. But there is absolutely no evidence that any Hebrew prophet ever saw a being whom he recognized as the pre-existent Christ, or an object that he could possibly interpret as representing an invisible and

[1] So called from the gamboling of the young.
[2] *Ex.*, vii, 16; x, 25 ff.; xi, 1-8.
[3] *Gal.*, iv, 10.

universal church. The "angel of the covenant" in Mal. iii, 1, is the celestial representative of Israel. The "angel of Yahwe" is, as Gunkel has seen,[1] a later substitute for Yahwe himself in the texts where he occurs, and there is no reason for supposing that this substitute was understood as being the Messiah. The "invisible church" was a creation of sixteenth century theology in its dilemma between disowning a visible church that cast out heretics but also held rich treasures of spiritual life, and owning a visible church that was a voluntary association of persons having a common religious interest but therefore also excluded the little ones. This conception might have brought about a very lofty fellowship, had it not been chained to earth by an irrational view of "the Word and the Sacraments." Neither prophets nor apostles ever dreamed of this invisible church. The latter thought of a heavenly Jerusalem; but this was a city destined to come down to earth and be seen of all men, not a church existing only in the souls of believers. Yahwe was once supposed to dwell in the darkness of the stormcloud, and to reveal his real nature in the sheen of the lightning. Hence a mysterious fire betokens his presence in Abraham's sacrifice,[2] and in the burning bush.[3] Originally the ladder from Bethel to heaven was for the use of gods whose abode was in the atmosphere or in the stars. Such ladders are known to other religions. Angels are degraded gods. The temple described in Ez. xl-xlviii is just such a house as the author thought that the restored sanctuary in Jerusalem should be. There is no suggestion of anything but a material structure. In the case of Pharao and Nebuchadnezzar there is no hint that they were typical of the devil; and when the author of Daniel represented Antiochus IV as a beast[4] he did not know

[1] *Genesis*, 1901, p. 170 f.

[2] *Gen.*, xv, 17.

[3] *Ex.*, iii, 2. Cf. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*, 1880, p. 27.

[4] Cf. W. Bousset, *Der Antichrist*, 1895, and Schmidt in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1900, p. 23 ff.

that this chaos-monster would later as a dragon be made the Antichrist and the Devil.

The reason why modern learning has abandoned this once so flourishing field of typology is readily perceived. It can find no place in history for many persons, events and institutions regarded as types. What at one time seemed unique is now seen to be the common expression of religious feeling. To an adequately trained historic sense it is quite obvious that the men whose views of life are revealed in the Hebrew Scriptures can never have associated with their religious institutions any such thought of Christ and his church as the typical interpretation assumes. If this interpretation is modified so as to affirm only the divinely intended typical significance, not the consciousness on the part of the Old Testament saints of such a meaning, the redemptive value of a faith that looks beyond the type to the antitype is surrendered, and the utility of the type both to those who were ignorant of its importance and to those who no longer needed it may be questioned.

Yet there is no error that does not contain an element of truth. Typology observed, compared and classified facts. It perceived the succession of analogous formations. It discerned the periodicity of history. It read the future in the light of the past, the history of earth in the light of heaven. This was a marked step forward in the direction of modern learning. "That is not first which is spiritual but that which is natural" is not precisely the doctrine of evolution, which affirms that the spiritual grows out of the natural, but it is the statement of a correctly observed fact essential to the truth of this doctrine. The division of history into dispensations absolutely distinct, yet constantly suggestive one of another, may be artificial, but it is now generally recognized that, owing to the substantial identity of physical environment and of mental processes, different periods show a most remarkable analogy of development.[1] It is impossible at present to share the fundamental assump-

[1] Cf. the thoughtful address by Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff on *Welt-perioden*, Göttingen, 1897.

tion on which antiquity based its view of the world. Man considered his dwelling-place, the earth, as a copy of heaven, the abode of the gods. He looked upon himself as formed in the image of the gods. His life he regarded as a reflection of the life of the gods, known through numerous myths. Particularly in the case of the heroes, this mythical lore furnished reliable legendary information.[1] Not only could the fate of individuals be read in the stars, but also that of the world itself. The incidents of the great cosmic year could be watched from its first moment to its last, or rather to the point where the circle closes to continue its round amid similar events. When in Gen. i, 2, man is made in the form of the gods and in I Cor. xv, 49, the existence of a man in heaven is proclaimed, whose image men on earth should bear; when in Ex. xxv, 9, a heavenly pattern of the tabernacle is shown to Moses, and in Heb. ix, 23, 24, the original sanctuary in heaven of which the tabernacle was a copy is purged by the Christ; when the model of Zion with its walls is constantly in Yahwe's presence in Isa. xlix, 16, and this heavenly Jerusalem comes down to earth in Rev. xxi, 10, and when the first things, cosmogony and paradise, reappear as the last things in Revelation and elsewhere, these ideas ultimately rest upon an astrological conception of the world. To a more critical view it is sufficiently apparent that man has made his gods in his own image, used his acquaintance with the earth in mapping out the

[1] This has been rightly emphasized by Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, ii, 1900, p. 275 ff. The secret of the remarkable stability of tradition does not lie in a miraculously retentive and conscientious memory but in the unchangeableness of the celestial spectacle and of the myths it suggests. A limited number of mythical motives were always at hand to complete, correct or adorn any heroic tale. Valuable as this observation is, it may easily be abused. We must guard against a new typology with its ready-made patterns in heaven playing havoc with our freshly acquired historic sense. The experiences of men that found their way to the sky in mythology have repeated themselves often enough in actual history without warranting a suspicion that they have each time dropped down from heaven. Our main interest at present, however, is that this new point of view be occupied.

sky, filled the heavens with beings whose fortunes were known to him only from his own experience, and found in actually observed phenomena of nature's life answers to the perplexing questions whence the world has come and whither its course will lead.

The modern estimate of the universe recognizes a law of evolution according to which the life that now is has developed out of the life that preceded it. Hence the similarity of persons, ideas, institutions and events in different ages. Baptism and eucharist remind of circumcision and passover; redemption through the blood of a human sacrifice resembles redemption through the blood of an animal sacrifice; a Messiah who takes vengeance on his enemies, conquers the nations, and exercises authority over them is not unlike a David or an Alexander Jannaeus; Sunday and Easter and Pentecost and Christmas are quite suggestive of Sabbath and Passover and Weeks and Dedication; angels and hypostases, mediating between Yahwe and the world, bring to mind the mediatory offices ascribed to the Christ. The reason for this is that the later, in part at least, was the spiritual offspring of the earlier. John the Baptist and Jesus were the heirs of Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah. Great men have their forerunners; important events cast their shadows before them. Times of spiritual quickening are preludes upon coming epochs.

The periodicity of history does not violate any law of evolution. If Babylon and Egypt, Greece and Rome, exhausted their creative strength, and younger, or more slowly maturing nations, taking up their work, had to run through similar stages of development, this was partly due to the natural limitations of all social life, partly to the fact that they entered only gradually into the spiritual heritage left by their predecessors. New periods are generally ushered in by a strong civilizing element, like Greek philosophy or Jewish religious thought, breaking its national bonds and seeking universal dominion. The principle of rational selection then comes into play. Nor is the fact of decline and death an infringement on the laws

of evolution. Still to some extent under the spell of a cosmogonic myth earlier evolutionists occasionally spoke of the universe as developing from a protoplasm, created out of nothing, into ever higher and more complex forms of life, even as the acorn grows into an oak. It is well, however, not to forget that, if the oak comes out of the acorn, the acorn also comes from the oak, and that the sturdiest oak will some day pay its tribute to corruption. The nebula from which our solar system, with all the precious treasures that it holds, has come, was no doubt an acorn fallen from some sidereal tree of life. When at some distant day it shall have run its course, it may well be that it will leave behind some seed to grow up in its own time and place. It has not emerged out of nothing, it will not go out into nothing. Like the astrology of the past, the science of the present time looks steadfastly into the heavens where alone it can read the origin and destiny of our planet. And in the new light types appear again. To him that has eyes to see, each form of life, be it small or great, points forward to some other thing that is to come.

CHAPTER IV

THE JEWISH MESSIAH

So far as documents give evidence, the expectation of a future deliverer of Israel, designated as the Messiah, seems to have appeared for the first time soon after the conquest of Palestine by Pompey in 63 B. C. It is found in the so-called Psalms of Solomon. The author of Ps. Sol. xvii, evidently a Pharisee, looks upon the rulers of the Hasmonaean house as robbers and usurpers, to whom the promise to David did not apply and who were justly deposed and punished by Pompey. As to Isaiah Assyria was the rod of Yahwe's anger to be used for the chastisement of his people because of the sins of the house of David and the nobles of Judah, and then to be broken, so to this psalmist Rome is the divine instrument by which punishment is administered for the sins of the "godless" kings who have placed themselves on the throne of David, and which is then to be destroyed. For the rightful King of Israel, the Son of David, Yahwe's Messiah,[1] is coming in the appointed time to crush the unjust rulers, purge Jerusalem of all foreign oppressors, destroy the impious heathen, bring together under his scepter all Jews, hold the nations under his yoke, and reign as a guiltless[2] and God-fearing prince over a righteous and holy people. Ps. Sol. xviii praises

[1] Thus undoubtedly the author wrote in *Ps. Sol.*, xvii, 36, ed. Swete, though a Christian copyist made it "Christ Lord." Cf. Kittel in Kautzsch, *Die Pseudepigraphen*, 1900, p. 147.

[2] That "pure from sin" does not mean absolute sinlessness is evident from the manner in which the psalmist speaks of the Pharisees. There will be no Bathsheba incident in the story of the Son of David. Though the Chronicler was silent, the Books of Samuel still spoke, and the blot on the great king's memory was keenly felt. Cf. *Ecclus.*, xlvii, 11.

him happy who shall live in the days when Yahwe's deliverance shall come. With his rod Yahwe's Messiah will in justice, wisdom and strength lead all his people in works of righteousness, through fear of God, and present them before the face of the Lord.[1]

The appearance of the Messianic hope at this time is quite natural. A century of martial prowess, independence and conquest had raised the highest expectations. The little people had not only indulged in a dream of empire; it had imagined itself to be in the midst of the actual conquest of the world. From these proud heights it had been hurled into the valley of humiliation. It had been rudely awakened from its dream to hear the tax-gatherer's voice. But this cruel disenchantment could not quench the spark of ambition. It flared up a-new, fanned by a fresh hatred. The persecuted Pharisees well knew the cause of the calamity. It was the Hasmonaean usurpation of the throne of David. To conquer the Roman power a genuine son of David was needed. Only to such an one could the divine promise in 2 Sam. vii, 12, apply. But while princes of the spurious house of David were numerous, real descendants of the old dynasty could not easily be found. In the beginning of the second century A. D. two Christian writers tried, both in vain, to discover the branches of David's family tree.[2] It was not so easy to find a living prince of this royal blood as in the days of Jehoiachin, Sheshbazzar, and Zerubbabel.

But God would provide in his own good time. What he had promised, he would surely fulfil. And had he not promised? The sacred writings were searched to discover promises of the Messiah. Many Hasmonaean psalms had been incorporated in "Davidic" hymnbooks. If at one time "David" was used as an appellative to designate the king who took the place of David, it is not impossible that the ascription in some instances originally intended to

[1] The king is responsible to God for the righteous conduct of every citizen.

[2] *Matth.*, i, 1 ff.; *Luke*, iii, 23 ff.

characterize the songs as referring to Yahwe's Anointed, his actually reigning vice-gerent on earth. But the Pharisees would naturally interpret these psalms as productions of the great king in the past. The question would then arise, Did he speak of himself or of another? In most cases the answer could not be doubtful. He spoke of a Messiah who was to come.

Nor were there lacking passages in the prophetic rolls that seemed to describe this future Messiah. Zechariah's Zerubbabel never sat upon the throne of his father David; the prophet therefore must have had another descendant of David in mind when he spoke of "the Shoot." If this obvious case of a frustrated national hope connected with a prince of the old dynasty, so common in the beginning of the reign of Darius Hystaspis,[1] could be pressed into service, it is no wonder that utterances of a similar origin and tenor that ultimately found their home in the great prophetic rolls lent themselves to the same use. A poem like Isa. ix, 1-6, celebrating the birth of a child destined for the throne of David, at a time when the people, living in a land of darkness, are under an oppressor's yoke and forced to bear his burdens, and the native kingdom needs to be set up and made strong, could no longer be seen against its natural background in the exile, since it had secured a place among the oracles of Isaiah. It was supposed to refer either to Hezekiah or the Messiah; and as the name that describes the new-born king *in spe* as "a counselor of wonders, a god of a warrior, a father of a multitude[2] and a prosperous prince" did not seem to harmonize with the history of Hezekiah, the preference was given to the Messiah. It was readily seen that in Isa. xi, 1-8, the fall of the dynasty is presupposed; the tree is down, the roots are left under ground. But this only showed that "the shoot from the stock of Jesse" did not belong to Isaiah's own time. He was a prophet, and could look from any given point in the future into a still

[1] Cf. Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, 1884, i, p. 613 ff., *Die Entstehung des Judenthums*, 1896, p. 82 ff.

[2] Read *edah*.

more distant future. Wherever a hope was expressed of a change in the fortunes of Israel, of better things to come, straightway it was imagined that the author thought of the Messiah and his reign. Thus the Messiah was given a place among eschatological conceptions that had grown up without any reference to him.

Out of the needs of a distressful time and the eager search in the Scriptures for the solace of divine promises, the idea of the Messiah as an eschatological magnitude seems to have been born. It was the culminating point where several independent tendencies in the life of Israel met. There had been a tendency to attach much importance to the anointment of rulers. From Saul to Zedekiah, from Joshua, son of Jehozadak, to Jason or Menelaus, from Jonathan to Aristobulus II, the rulers of the state, whether kings, high-priests, or priest-kings, had been consecrated with oil. Originally unction was an application of sacrificial fat.[1] The pouring of oil upon the sacred stone, in which the numen dwelt,[2] was a sacrifice. At Medina a pre-Islamic worshiper washed and anointed his idol.[3] The king was a holy being to whom this offering was made. He was like the Elohim knowing good and evil. With the anointment a spirit had entered him.[4] He was sacrosanct; his body must not be touched.[5] He was gradually removed from the gaze of the people, and seen only by his officials.[6] The high-priest was the head of the state in post-exilic times. He was Yahwe's Anointed, a "son of oil,"[7] having access to the celestial court.[8] In the Hasmonaean age, the priest-king was regarded as Yahwe's Messiah, his "son," a

[1] Cf. W. Robertson Smith, *Religion of the Semites*, 1894, p. 384.
[2] *Gen.*, xxviii, 13; xxxv, 14.
[3] *Ibn Hisham* quoted by W. Robertson Smith, l. c., p. 233.
[4] I *Sam.*, xvi, 13. Cf. Weinel, *Mashach und seine Derivate*, 1898, p. 55 ff.
[5] I *Sam.*, xxiv, 10.
[6] II *Kings*, xix, 15.
[7] *Zech.*, iv, 14.
[8] *Zech.*, iii, 7.

"god," sitting on his throne.[1] It is easy to surmise whither this tendency alone would have led. Had the dream of Daniel been realized, and the dominion over the nations been given to the saints of the Maccabaean period. the king of Israel would have been worshiped as a god, and Jerusalem rather than Rome would have become the seat of the imperial cult.

There was also a tendency to repose an extraordinary faith in the dynasty founded by David. The reason for this was of course its remarkable longevity. A duration of four hundred and fifty years would have been a noteworthy achievement of a royal family in any age or nation. In view of the trying historical circumstances and the quick succession of dynasties in many of the surrounding nations, it must have appeared quite wonderful. It is not strange, therefore, that even when Judah was finally threatened with destruction by the Chaldaeans a writer should have expressed the confidence that the house of David would continue to reign forever.[2] Nor is it a cause of astonishment that, as long as princes of this family lived and even received signal honors at the hands of Chaldaean and Persian kings, as was the case with Jehoiachin, Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel, the hope of national independence should connect itself with these shoots from the old stock. The gradual disappearance of prominent members of this family no doubt gave room for independent aspirations. Sanballat may have been right[3] in declaring that prophets in Jerusalem had announced as the coming king of Israel Nehemiah,[4] the governor, ca. 385-373 B. C.[5] In the next

[1] *Pss.*, ii, xlv, lviii, lxxii, cx.

[2] II *Sam.*, vii, 12, 14. Vs. 13 is an interpolation. Cf. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, 1889, p. 257.

[3] *Neh.*, vi, 7.

[4] Cf. Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile*, 1898, p. 46 ff., Schmidt, *Nehemiah and his Work* in the *Biblical World*, 1899, p. 338.

[5] For the date of Nehemiah in the reign of Artaxerxes II. Mnemon, cf. Marquart, *Fundamente israelitischer und jüdischer Geschichte*,

century Simon became prince as well as high-priest, and Aristobulus I king, without belonging to the Davidic family. But the strength of the legitimist feeling may be seen both in the fiction by which the actual occupant of the throne was designated as David's descendant, and in the indignant protest of the Pharisees against this fiction. This loyalty to the legitimate line, with the increasing difficulty of finding a leader who should also be a real descendant of David, necessarily tended to remove into the future the Messianic king and to enhance the scope of his work.

Of even greater importance was the general tendency to look beyond present conditions for better things or for worse. This had always been strong in Israel. To the mass of the people in earlier times the "day of Yahwe" probably meant the day of God-given victory and prosperity. The majority of prophets no doubt shared the same view. There were more Hananiahs than Jeremiahs. A few of Yahwe's spokesmen, however, looking into the future, could see nothing but darkness. They were soothsayers, as were their colleagues. It is a strange misapprehension of their character that seeks to disguise this fact. Their eyes were constantly turned toward the future. They watched for the footsteps of their God; they looked for the coming of the day of Yahwe. But the approach of this day filled them with terror; the signs of the times indicated to them that he was coming to sit in judgment on his people. Why must he come to his people with chastisement? Because he loved and would save his own. For this reason, too, they must wield the scourge, laying bare the social iniquity for which no sacrificial cult could atone. Jeremiah recognized no true prophets except the prophets of doom.[1] Such collections of oracles by Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Micah as were known at the time contained as yet no glowing descriptions of future happiness with which Hananiah might have confronted his critic. Men like Han-

1896, p. 31 ff.; Torrey, *The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemiah*, 1898, p. 8, 49; Schmidt, *l. c.*, p. 334 ff.

[1] XXVIII, 8.

aniah, who proclaimed good tidings to the people, and introduced their oracles with a "Thus saith Yahwe," were unquestionably quite sincere, and derived their information from the same source, the inspiration of Yahwe.[1] But their diagnosis of the disease and their appreciation of the historic situation were more defective. History justified the gloomier forebodings. The pre-exilic prophets had proved to be genuine sooth-sayers. To this fact they owed the high regard in which later generations held them,[2] and we owe the preservation of their oracles.

After the deportation of parts of the people in 597, 586 and 581 B. C., the prophecy of coming evil naturally ceased among the exiles, and the old, popular hope of the day of Yahwe revived. While some attached much value to the re-establishment of the dynasty,[3] others put the emphasis entirely on the overthrow of the present world-power, the return of the exiles, and the vengeance upon and authority over certain nations, and the prosperity to come. Perhaps the most influential writer of the period, the remarkable genius to whom we owe Isa. xl-xlviii, did not concern himself about the Davidic family when Yahwe had plainly raised up a king (an anointed one) to accomplish his purpose, to destroy Babylon, send the exiles home, build the temple, and allow Jacob to lord it over his enemies. The same spirit prevails in the Songs of Zion in Isa. xlix-lv. Even when the future came to be seen in more somber colors by the authors of "Malachi," Isa. lvi ff. and Joel, eschatology developed without including any Messianic idea. The translated Elijah was indeed to come back from heaven before Yahwe could return to his temple, but for the Messiah there was as yet no place. The coming of Elijah

[1] On the artificial distinction between false prophets and true, cf. J. C. Matthes, *De pseudoprophetismo Hebraeorum*, Leiden, 1859; Kuenen, *De profeten en de profetie onder Israël*, Leiden, 1875, and the criticism of certain positions in this work by Pierson, *Een studie over de geschriften van Israëls profeten*, Amsterdam, 1877.

[2] *Zech.*, i, 6.

[3] *Ez.*, xvii, 22 ff.; *Isa.*, ix., 1-6, xi, 1-6; *Amos*, ix, 11 ff.; *Hag.*, ii, 23; *Zech.*, iv, 6 ff.; *Jer.*, xxx, 8.

is also referred to in Ecclus. xlviii, 10, without any suggestion in regard to the Messiah.[1]

This is also true of the apocalyptic literature that flourished in the Hasmonaean period. In Daniel, God establishes his kingdom on earth without a Messiah. In heaven the Most High judges, the beast is slain, and the angel representing Israel receives the kingdom of the world; this angel (Michael) fights with the angel of Greece, and stands up in the end victoriously for his people. On earth Antiochus Epiphanes meets his death, the Jews obtain dominion over the nations, and some martyrs and their persecutors rise from among the dead to long lives of glory and of shame. The celestial patterns have grown richer. But there is among them no Messiah. Next to the Ancient of Days, who alone exercises judgment, Michael, the dragon-killer, the judaized Marduk, figures prominently. In the terrestrial copy, the drama of history, the succession of world powers, with their allotted periods of time, and the participation of saints raised from the dead are new features. But no king has anything to do with the foundation of the new empire any more than with the resurrection of the dead.

It is natural that the disposition to map out the future should have been encouraged by the stirring events of the Maccabaean insurrection, and also that there should have been no reason for putting into the future a Messianic king while Yahwe's anointed was actually sitting on the throne of David and engaged in restoring the kingdom and conquering the world. The atmosphere of the Psalter is saturated with the desire for divine judgment upon the

[1] A comparison of the Hebrew text with the Greek and, in this place, especially the Ethiopic version, suggests that the last lines should be read:

"Blessed is he who saw thee (Elijah) and died for love of thee;
As for us we shall surely live through thee."

The passage is apparently an interpolation in "The Praise of Famous Men," a work written by Simeon, the son of Jesus, son of Eleazar ben Sira, as the colophon in the Hebrew indicates. See Schmidt, *Ecclesiasticus*, 1903, p. 174.

heathen nations, and breathes a pathetic confidence in the dynasty occupying the Davidic throne.[1] Even among the Jews of Egypt this mood prevailed. Around the temple at Leontopolis built by Onias III several colonies seemed to have settled, in which the language of Canaan continued to be spoken. An older prophecy against Egypt was here given an appendix written in apocalyptic style.[2] The present condition is predicted, and the future is also prophesied. It is evident that the recognition of Jonathan by Alexander Balas on the occasion of his marriage to Cleopatra 150 B. C. inspired the author's hopes. Jonathan is probably the deliverer of vs. 20; the smiting and healing of Egypt and the triple alliance of Syria, Egypt and Israel belong to the future. The Alexandrian Jews also looked eagerly into the future. Some fruits of their apocalyptic speculation they put into the spacious lap of the Sibyl. In the reign of Ptolemy VII Physcon (145-117) the author of the larger part of Book III of the Sibylline Oracles prophesied to the nations what had already happened to them, that they might believe the more implicitly in the disclosures of things still to come. Having turned from Hellas, where Corinth has been destroyed in 146 B. C., to the temple of the great God and his people, he describes how God sends from the sun a king who puts an end to the bad war, killing some and making sure treaties with others, following not his own counsel but the decrees of the great God, and in whose reign the people is prosperous and the earth fruitful.[3] After this the kings of the nations assemble against Jerusalem, God himself destroys them and finally establishes his kingdom for all time over all men.[4] The king "from the sun," like

[1] This eschatological mood has been well described by Stade, *Die Messianische Hoffnung im Psalter* in *Akademische Reden und Abhandlungen*, 1899, p. 39 ff. The political background of the Psalter is most satisfactorily depicted by Duhm, *Die Psalmen*, 1899.

[2] *Isa.*, xix, 16-25.

[3] *Oracula Sibyllina*, III, 652-660, ed. Rzach.

[4] III, 660 ff.

the king "from heaven,"[1] is an Eastern monarch from the standpoint of the Sibyl whose home is at Erythrae opposite Chios. The former is no doubt Simon, as the latter is Cyrus. That the Messiah cannot be meant[2] is clear from the fact that this king completely disappears when the author's real eschatology begins and plays no part whatever in the last things, while the description admirably suits the great contemporaneous leader of the chosen people.

The supply of prophecy was quite equal to the demand. When Simon was appointed hereditary high-priest and ruler of the people, this action was made subject to prophetic ratification.[3] A psalmist in Jerusalem[4] and a Sibyllist in Alexandria soon furnished the necessary oracle. A highly advanced eschatology without the slightest suggestion of a Messiah meets us in Isa. xxiv-xxvii. In the original apocalypse, written ca. 128 B. C.,[5] the judgment of the world begins with the incarceration of the great powers in heaven and on earth, whereupon Yahwe appears in Zion, and offers a festive meal to all nations. The Jews are then hidden while the judgment goes on, and when the great trumpet blows the scattered Israelites come to-

[1] III, 286.

[2] Already in the edition of Koch (Opsopaeus), Paris, 1599, a note, possibly from the hand of Chateillon, in the margin opposite III, 286, indicates that the king "from heaven" is "Christus," though the next lines are seen to refer to "the restoration of the temple after the Babylonish captivity." The Messianic interpretation is generally abandoned in this place, except possibly by Hilgenfeld, *Jüdische Apokalyptik*, 1857, p. 64. It is the great merit of Hilgenfeld to have determined the date of these apocalyptic sketches. But Vernes has convincingly shown that Cyrus is referred to in III, 286; *Histoire des idées Messianiques*, 1874, p. 59 f., and Colani, *Jésus Christ et les Croyances Messianiques de son temps*, 1864, p. 25 ff., as well as Vernes, *l. c.*, p. 64 ff., has proved that III, 660, probably refers to Simon.

[3] *I Macc.*, xiv, 46.

[4] *Ps.*, cx.

[5] The situation was first recognized by Duhm, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 1892. Cf. also Marti, *Das Buch Jesaia*, 1900.

gether to Zion. An interpolation describes the resurrection of faithful Yahwe-worshipers through the dew of healing.[1]

Somewhat later in the reign of John Hyrcanus the earliest part of the Book of Enoch seems to have appeared. In Eth. En. i-xxxvi a description is given of the judgment of angels and men. The angels who sinned with women,[2] are imprisoned and finally punished; wicked men either remain forever in Sheol to be punished there, or are transferred to Gehenna, where their spirits are slain; the righteous rise to eat of the tree of life in the new Jerusalem, where they will beget many children, have plenty of food, and grow old in peace. Neither in connection with the judgment nor in the new kingdom is there any Messiah. Between Daniel and this book the tremendous step has been taken of making Sheol a place of conscious existence, where some are punished for ever, and consequently need not be raised to life again to get their deserts. Eth. En. lxxxiii-xc, written ca. 106 B. C., presents an outline of Biblical history in which the antediluvians figure as cattle, the nations living after the flood as various kinds of beasts, and the Israelites as sheep. The characters are very plainly portrayed, however. One of the sheep, Elijah, is carried on high to be with Enoch.[3] Seventy shepherds, the angels of the nations, originally their gods, are in charge of the sheep during the period of foreign domination. This comes to an end when upon the lambs (*i. e., chasids*) horns begin to appear (the sons of Mattathias). Particularly on one of these sheep (no doubt, John Hyrcanus) a great horn grows out that cannot be broken by the ravens (the Syrians under Antiochus VII). Michael, as scribe in the rôle of Nabu, ascertains that the last twelve shepherds have destroyed more than their predecessors, and a sword is given to the sheep. A throne is erected in Palestine, the final judgment is held, the new

[1] So the Greek version seems to have read.

[2] *Gen.*, vi, 1 ff.

[3] LXXXIX, 52.

Jerusalem is set up, martyrs are raised, all are invited and Jerusalem is filled with white sheep. The picture is apparently completed, when the figure of a white bull appears that is feared by all beasts and, when all other animals have become white bulls also, is changed into a buffalo with black horns.[1] It is generally understood that this bull is the Messiah and also admitted that he has nothing to do here. His appearance when all is done is accounted for as "a literary reminiscence,"[2] or a piece of "the official traditional dogmatic repertoire of the synagogue."[3] Vss. 37 and 38—except "the lord of the sheep rejoiced over them"—are probably an addition by a later hand. In Eth. En. xci-civ, probably written ca. 70 B. C., the description of the eighth and following weeks (xci, 12-19), before the first week (xciii, 3 ff) is manifestly due to a displacement. But this is itself most naturally explained, if it originally was a marginal annotation, as it has the appearance of being. If this conjecture is correct, the eschatology would not differ essentially from that of sections already considered. There is no Messiah in this booklet.

It will be seen that a system of eschatology had developed before the Roman period, including such features as the judgment of angels and of men, and their punishment in hell, the great banquet in Zion, the resurrection of at least some of the dead, and the establishment of the kingdom of heaven, but as yet no personal Messiah. The reason is obvious. It is Yahwe himself who judges the world, prepares his meal for all nations, raises the dead and reigns on the earth.

Veneration for the anointed ruler of the state, loyalty to the old dynasty, and speculation about the world's future, prepared the way for the Messiah. Roman oppression caused a fusion of these elements. An anointed king of Israel was needed. But he must be a genuine son

[1] XC, 37, 38.

[2] Charles, *The Book of Enoch*, 1893, p. 258.

[3] Beer, in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen*, 1900, p. 298.

of David. As no claimant to the throne of the legitimate line was known, he necessarily belonged to the future. But even as an eschatological magnitude his functions remained for a long time purely political, and the Messianic hope was cherished only by some fractions of the people. This fact renders it difficult to believe that the Messiah conception developed under the influence of Persian thought. The Mazdayasnian Saoshyas had no political character. He was expected to raise the dead and to renew the world.[1]

The Egyptian Jews participated, if at all, to a very limited extent in the new hope. That the translators of Isa. ix, 5 and Ps. cx, 3 (cix, 3 in the Greek) had the Messiah in mind, is not certain. In rendering the first three words of the name "angel of great counsel," the former followed the common custom of substituting "angel" for "god"; in translating "from the womb before the dawn I have begotten thee," the latter slavishly followed the text word for word.[2] It may have been during the second triumvirate (before 30 B. C.), that a Jewish Sibyllist predicted that Rome's conquest of Egypt would be succeeded by the kingdom of "the immortal God," "the great king," by the coming of "the holy ruler," whose reign would extend over the whole earth and last for all times. This holy ruler is supposed by some interpreters to be the Messiah; but the context rather favors the view that none else is intended than the "immortal God" and "great king."[3]

[1] *Yasht*, xix, 92 ff. Cf. N. Söderblom, *La vie future dans le Mazdeisme*, 1901.

[2] Whether "he is the expectation of nations" was the original rendering in *Gen.*, xlix, 10, may be doubted. In *Num.*, xxiv, 17, the Davidic house is meant. On the change of Agag into Gog, cf. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, 1857, p. 366, and also Schmidt, article "*Scythians*" in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*. The originality and age of either rendering are uncertain.

[3] *Oracula Sibyllina*, iii, 46-62, 75-92. It is possible, however, that Otho, Galba and Vitellius are meant rather than Antonius, Octavianus and Lepidus, that vss. 53, 54 refer to the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 A. D., and that the widow is not Cleopatra but Rome, vss. 75 ff. So E. Preusehen, *Paulus als Antichrist* in *Zeitschrift für die Neutesta-*

The Book of Wisdom, written about the beginning of our era, contains no allusion to the Messiah. Philo (ca. 20 B. C.-50 A. D.) describes the return of the Israelites to Palestine "led by a divine or more than human apparition."[1] He also declares that, if enemies should attack the future kingdom of peace, they would be scattered, since in that case a man would come, according to the promise, who would subdue the nations, God granting to the pious auxiliaries in psychic power and bodily strength.[2] The "apparition" is probably the divine glory, the Shechinah. Briggs[3] may be right in judging from the context in the latter passage that Philo thought of deliverance through manly qualities rather than through a man. A second reference to Balaam's prophecy[4] is not decisive. That he interpreted Zech. vi, 12 as an allusion to the Logos, which he never identified with the Messiah, is significant. The Slavonic Enoch, probably written in Egypt before 70 A. D.,[5] knows nothing of a Messiah.

Even in Palestine the Messianic hope expressed in the Psalter of Solomon was manifestly far from common. In the circles whence the book of Ecclesiastes proceeded (ca. 30 B. C.) there naturally was no sympathy with such

mentliche Wissenschaft, vol. II, 190, p. 173 ff. Under all circumstances it is Simon Magus that is meant by the Beliar who comes from the Sebastenes. This name for the Samaritans is not possible before 27 B. C., and vs. 63 ff. must have been written by a Christian. This makes the context also doubtful. Bousset has recently suggested a reflection of "pagan-Messianic" hopes in III, 47 f. *Die Religion des Judentums im Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter,* 1902, p. 212.

[1] *De Execrationibus,* ed. Mangey, III, 437.

[2] *De proemis et poenis,* II, 421-428 (ed. Mangey).

[3] *The Messiah of the Gospels,* 1894, p. 38.

[4] In *Vita Mosis,* II, 126.

[5] So Charles, *The Book of the Secrets of Enoch,* 1896, p. 26. The only real reason adduced is the references to sacrifices in lix, 2. But they are so slight and so easily explained by the author's guise that there can be no real assurance as to this date.

illusions. But neither the Book of Jubilees[1] nor the Assumption of Moses i-vi;[2] written in the beginning of our era, mentions the Messiah, though there were natural occasions for doing so. The original Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs may have received their first Jewish interpolations in the same period. There is no reference to the Messiah in them. But Michael is described as "the mediator between God and man."[3] In an apocalyptic fragment of Jewish origin incorporated in the book of Revelation,[4] and dating, as Wellhausen has seen,[5] from the siege of Jerusalem, a woman in heaven, clothed with sun, moon and stars, brings forth a man child that is immediately carried to God, and the dragon is cast by Michael from heaven to earth, where he pursues the woman, who escapes, and her kin for three years and a half. Ultimately this figure of a queen of heaven with her celestial child no doubt belongs to the realm of mythology as much as Michael and the dragon.[6] The earthly events that the

[1] "And one of thy sons" in *Jubilees*, xxxi, 18, is clearly an interpolation. It may refer to David, as Charles thinks, *Doctrine of a Future Life*, 1899, p. 246.

[2] The *Assumption of Moses* consists of an original part i-vi, and an appended passage that probably dates from a much later period when the rebellion of Simon bar Kozeba had already been crushed. The description of fearful persecutions does not give the impression of being a work of imagination based on the sufferings under Antiochus Epiphanes. The crucifixion of Jews is a peculiarity of the later persecution. The Taxon, ix, may be Jehudah ben Baba, who fled with his seven disciples. The second cruel punishment at least presupposes the destruction in 70 A. D. Probably that and the one in 135 A. D. are meant.

[3] *Dan.*, vi.

[4] XI, 1, 2; xii.

[5] *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, 1899, p. 225 ff.

[6] Ninib, Ishara's son, is the rising sun and also the planet Saturn; Jensen, *Die Kosmologie der Babylonier*, 1890, pp. 136 ff., 242, 457 ff. Yaldabaoth, "Bau's son," the god of the Jews, is also Saturn. Origen *Contra Celsum*, vi, 31, Epiphanius, *Adv. Haer.*, xxvi, 10. Bau seems to be the counterpart of Gula, Ninib's consort (Jensen); but Bau has apparently also taken Ishara's place. Was either of these goddesses ever identified with Ishtar? Epiphanius relates (ed. Dindorf,

author desires to symbolize are in the main clear. Deliverance will come after the short but trying time prophesied by Daniel. Rage as it may, Rome will not be able to destroy the remnant that has escaped its clutches, nor to touch the sanctuary itself in Jerusalem, nor to prevent the coming of the Messiah. This Messiah has been born in the Jewish community, but has already as a child been translated. A similar idea appears in the Babylonian Talmud,[1] where the Messiah is a deceased descendant of David, who rises from the dead to accomplish the deliverance of Israel.[2] Both of these notions were due to the conviction that God would provide a genuine son of David. A translated hero would naturally return on the clouds of heaven. Thus in the Apocalypse of Baruch, written after the fall of Jerusalem, the Messiah is "revealed,"[3] and "returns in glory"[4] to rule until the world of corruption is at an end,[5] sparing some and putting others to death.[6]

The Fourth Book of Ezra, written in 97 A. D., exhibits similar Christological conceptions. In vii, 28 ff., God declares that his son, the Messiah, will be revealed during four hundred years, and then die together with all men, whereupon the present aeon will close and the new age

ii, 483) that on the day of the winter solstice the virgin Chaamu and her son Dusares were praised, and that the same was done in Elusa on that night. In Elusa the goddess Chalazath, or Venus, had her temple. The celestial virgin is probably Ishtar—Venus, and the solar deity (Ninib, Yaldabaoth, Dusares), is her son. Cf. Baethgen, *Beiträge zur Semitschen Religionsgeschichte,* 1888, p. 107. On Yaldabaoth, see Lipsius, *Ueber die Ophitischen Systeme in Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie,* 1863, 460; Baudissin, *Studien zur Semitischen Religions-geschichte,* 1876, p. 231 ff.; Dietrich, *Abraxas,* 1891, pp. 6, 46.

[1] *Sanhedrin,* 98 b.

[2] Cf. the discriminating observations of Louis Ginzberg, *Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums,* 1898, p. 541 ff.

[3] XXIX, 3; xxxix, 7.

[4] XXX, 1.

[5] XL, 3.

[6] LXXII, 2-6.

begin after seven days of silence with the resurrection of the dead and the appearance of the Most High on the judgment-seat. The woman,[1] who brings forth a child, loses him as she is about to give him a wife, and flees into the wilderness, is none else than the woman of Rev. xii; the presumption is that originally the son was also the Messiah, though the present text of x, 44 ff. explains him to be the city itself, or the temple. The lion that rebukes the eagle is declared to be the Christ who has been preserved for the end from the seed of David, and will appear to annihilate the wicked enemy and to give the remnant of the people joy until the judgment comes.[2] Finally, the man-like, or angelic, being that rises from the sea, and flies with the clouds of heaven destroying an army with the fire that issues from his mouth, is explained to be the son of God, through whom creation will be redeemed and a new order established.[3] It is emphatically stated that God is not to judge his creation through any one.[4] While this apocalypse in other respects shows the influence of early Christian thought, it still protests against ascribing judgment to the Messiah.

This step had apparently been taken, not indeed in the apocalypse ascribed to John, but in two other works of a similar character that probably appeared, like it, in the reign of Domitian, viz.: Ethiopic Enoch xxxvii-lxxi and The Wisdom of God. The former designates itself as the second vision of Enoch. It is composed of three hortatory discourses and an appendix. This work has not come down to us in its original form. We possess only an Ethiopic translation of a Greek translation, or of the probably Aramaic original. How accurately these translators did their work, and what changes may have been introduced by copyists, cannot be determined. It would be a miracle, if a piece of writing that offered such peculiar

[1] IX, 43 ff.
[2] XII, 31 ff.
[3] XIII, 1 ff.
[4] V, 56; vi, 6.

temptations should have escaped the common fate of books. Yet it is not likely that the universally admitted longer interpolations were made by the Greek translator or subsequent to his time. It has long been recognized that En. xxxix, 1, 2a, liv, 7, lv, 2, lx, lxv, l-lxix, 25 are extracts from a lost Apocalypse of Noah. Charles is probably right in assuming that xli, 3-8, xliii, and xliv, have come from the same source. He also rightly regards xlii, l, lxx and lxxi as later additions. But what remains is not the work of one hand. The original vision probably contained xxxvii, xxxviii, xxxix, 3-13, xl, xli, l, 2, xlv, l, 2, 5, 6, xlvii, xlviii, 8-10, liii, 1-5, liv, 1-6, lv, 3, lvi, lvii, lviii (lxiii, lxiv). In this work God alone is the judge, and there is no Messiah. This book seems to have been annotated and expanded by a writer who looked forward to the revelation of a chosen instrument, not merely for the punishment of the nations, but for the judgment of the world, a man destined to sit upon a glorious throne to judge angels and men (xlv, 3, 4, xlvi, li, liii, 6, lv, 4, lxi, 8, 9). There can be little doubt that this writer had in mind the Messiah, and that he understood the being like a man in Dan. vii, 13, to be the Messiah. Yet the manuscript, as he left it, cannot yet have contained any unmistakable Messianic term, since the author of ch. lxxi evidently regarded "the man who has righteousness" of xlvi, 3, as Enoch. Israel's celestial representative in Dan. vii, 13, had not been mentioned by name. Originally he was no doubt Michael. But there was room for conjecture: he might be the Messiah, or a translated hero like Enoch. The conception of the Messiah as judge of the world may be due to Christian influence, but the author of these interpolations is not likely to have been a disciple of Jesus. In that case he would probably have referred to the sufferings of the Messiah. A Christian hand may have cautiously retouched the picture in chs. xlviii, lxii and lxix, 26 ff.

In Luke xi, 40, a work called "The Wisdom of God" is quoted. In this book the esoteric wisdom of the apoca-

lyptic seer is personified and predicts the future. Strauss[1] has convincingly shown that not only the prediction of vengeance for the blood of martyred prophets from Abel to Zechariah the son of Barachiah, slain during the siege of Jerusalem (Jos., *Bellum jud.* iv, 335, 343), but also the woe upon Jerusalem, so often visited in vain by the divine wisdom, that immediately follows in Matth. xxiii, 37 ff., was drawn from this source. It is altogether probable that the apocalyptic fragment that follows in Matth. xxiv, 4-36 (Mk. xiii, 5-32; Luke xxi, 8-36), and the groundwork of xxv, 31 ff. were likewise extracts from the same work. Strauss assumed a Christian authorship for the "Wisdom of God." But the statement, "Your house is left unto you desolate," does not suggest that it must remain so; it only mentions what to the author is manifestly a very sad fact of experience. There is nothing in the description of the last days of Jerusalem, the flight, or the coming of the man on the cloud, that is distinctly Christian. The revelation of the future given by Jesus to John on Patmos may have inspired some Christian to use this material for another Apocalypse of Jesus. The further development of certain ideas in En. xxxvii-lxxi and the Wisdom of God by the disciples of Jesus naturally caused a reaction against them in rabbinic circles.

Josephus was unquestionably familiar with the Messianic idea. It is possible, however, that under the influence of his Essene (?) teacher, Banus, and as a result of the hopeless struggle, he had learned to look forward to a quiet possession of the land by Israel and a spread of Judaism throughout the world,[2] even though it were under Roman suzerainty,[3] rather than to a personal Messiah. Yet he was far from a consistent quietist, and may in his heart have cherished hopes with which he did not care to make Vespasian acquainted. It is a pity that he

[1] *Jesu Weheruf über Jerusalem* in *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1863, p. 84.

[2] *Ant.*, iv, 125, ed. Niese.

[3] *De bel'o jud.*, vi, 313.

should have remembered that he was nothing but a historian just as he was on the point of explaining what the "little stone" in Daniel[1] signified.[2] In describing the insurrections led by Judas, son of Ezekias,[3] (ca. 4 B. C.), Judas the Galilaean,[4] (ca. 7 A. D.), the Samaritan in Tirathana[5] (ca. 37 A. D.), Theudas[6] (ca. 46 A. D.), the Egyptian (ca. 58 A. D.) and others, Josephus may have intentionally refrained from characterizing them as Messianic movements.[7] It is quite possible that one or another of these "sorcerers" and "prophets," as he called them, may have been greeted as the Messiah, and regarded himself as such. Acts v, 36, suggests that this was the case of Theudas. Hausrath[8] sought to identify the Samaritan of Ant. xviii, 85 ff. with Simon Magus. The historic character of Simon Magus is very doubtful; neither II Macc. ii, 5 ff. nor Ap. Bar. vi, renders it clear that even the Jews expected the Messiah, rather than some prophet like Jeremiah, to point out the place of the hidden vessels; the late story in John iv, in which the profound philosophy of the Fourth Evangelist is so beautifully symbolized, furnishes no evidence of Messianic beliefs among the Samaritans of the first century; and the age of the Ta'eb conception cannot be determined with any certainty. Yet it is not impossible that the hosts that gathered in Tirathana looked upon their leader as the Ta'eb, or "Revenant," come back from heaven, to which he had been translated, to establish a kingdom greater than Gog's. Judas, of Gamala, seems to have been the founder of the party of the Zealots. His sons and a grandson continued his oppo-

[1] On the high value he placed upon the book of *Daniel*, cf. Schmidt, article *Bible Canon, Critical View* in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* and article *Bible* in the *New International Encyclopaedia.*

[2] *Ant.*, x, 210.

[3] *De bello jud.*, ii, 56.

[4] *De bello jud.*, ii, 118.

[5] *Ant.*, xviii, 85 ff.

[6] *Ant.*, xx, 97 f.

[7] *Ant.*, xx, 160.

[8] *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1879, I, pp. 382-386.

sition to Rome. But there is no intimation that he was considered as the Messiah, nor indeed that such a being had a place in his "philosophy." On the other hand, it is entirely probable that during the siege of Jerusalem one or another of the leaders felt himself called to the Messiahship and fired the enthusiasm of his followers with Messianic expectations.[1]

The best authenticated instance of a Jewish Messiah is that of Simon bar Kozeba.[2] Of him alone can it be said that he was not only recognized by his people as the Messiah at a time when the Messianic idea was fully developed, and regarded himself as such, but also succeeded in achieving temporarily the redemption of Jerusalem and thus in part realizing his ideal. Simon's home may have been in Modein,[3] and he was undoubtedly inspired by the story of the Hasmonaean insurrection. When circumcision had been prohibited and an attempt made to build a temple to Jupiter in Jerusalem, now called Aelia Capitolina, this heroic soul, like Mattathias of old, felt a divine call to lead his people against the oppressor. When success crowned his efforts, and even the great Akiba greeted him as Bar Kokeba, "son of the star" (alluding to Num. xxiv, 17), and as "king Messiah,"[4] when Eleazar the priest stood by his side, and the people recognized him as "Israel's prince,"[5] how could he doubt that God had chosen him for the deliverance of Zion? He was indeed no descendant of David. But the title "Son of David" could be taken in a general sense as denoting a successor of David, a king sitting upon David's throne, as well as in

[1] *Matth.*, xxiv, 24 f.

[2] Bousset thinks that his home was in Kokaba, referring to Julius Africanus, as quoted in Eusebius *Hist. Eccl.*, I, 7, 14 (*Die Religion des Judentums*, 1903, p. 211). But this is probably a misunderstanding of the name given him by R. Akiba (*Taanith*, 68d).

[3] His uncle Eleazar lived in Modein, cf. W. Bacher, *Die Agada der Tannaiten*, 1883, p. 194 ff. Modein is probably the modern El Medyeh, near Lydda-El Ludd.

[4] *Taanith*, 68d.

[5] Cf. the coins in Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, 1881, pp. 239, 244.

the narrower sense of a lineal descendant always affected by the opposition.[1] Concerning the preëxistence of the Messiah opinions differed. Some held that all souls had existed before their birth, yet no one could remember such a previous existence. The reaction against thoughts peculiar to the followers of Jesus had probably removed some of the transcendental aspects of the Messianic ideal. The Messiah expected even by an Akiba was just the kind of man that Simon was. When the rebellion was crushed by Hadrian in 135 A. D., the fearful disenchantment expressed itself in curses upon Simon's head. He was sneeringly referred to as the "son of a lie." Had he succeeded, he would have remained "son of the star" forever. Synagogue and church vied with each other in calling him a false Messiah, an impostor, a liar. On both sides curious prejudices prevailed.[2] In one circle, the establishment of a Jewish kingdom of righteousness by the sword of a mighty hero whose picture was found on many a page of the Bible was ardently desired, but patriotism was apparently no longer regarded as a virtue when it failed to put an end to oppression. In another circle, Simon was expected to measure himself by the ideal of a lamb willingly led to slaughter, a non-resistant teacher of universal love, an ideal that the immediate disciples of Jesus never dreamed of associating with the Messiahship until after the crucifixion of the Master. Simon miscalculated

[1] Cf. *Ps. Sol.*, xvii, 4, 5, 21. Jochanan ben Torta in *Taanith*, 68d; *Mark*, xii, 35-37 (*Matth.* xxii, 41-46; *Luke*, xx, 41-44). The words put upon the lips of Jesus in the last of these passages show both that the opponents of the claims made for Jesus by his disciples insisted upon lineal descent and that the defenders did not feel hampered by the fact that Jesus was not a descendant of David and were at no loss to find Scriptural support for their view. No aspirant to the Messiahship is likely to have been seriously inconvenienced by his pedigree. It was a handy weapon, however, of the opposition, and the genealogists in *Matth.*, i, and *Luke*, iii, sought to wrest it out of the hands of the enemy.

[2] Cf. the wise words of Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 1879, I, p. 203 f.

Hadrian's strength, as Kossuth did the combined forces of Hapsburgs and Romanoffs. But there is something sublime in the bold defiance of the divine Caesar on the throne of the world by the hero of a petty oppressed people. The Messianic ideal was a political one, but should not for this cause be condemned.

The hope of deliverance could not perish. It voiced itself in the Shemoneh Esreh.[1] What was needed was a genuine descendant of David (14, 15), and a restoration of the cult (17). This expectation also found expression in a psalm interpolated in the Hebrew text of the Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach, between 51:12 and 13. Beside the budding of the horn of the house of David the choice of the sons of Zadok is mentioned. A legitimate high priesthood was not less important than a legitimate royalty of the Davidic line. Eleazar is mentioned on the coins of "Jerusalem Delivered" by the side of Simon, as in earlier days Joshua by the side of Zerubbabel. But neither Eleazar nor Simon bar Kozeba could quite satisfy the sticklers for legitimacy—when their régime had come to an unfortunate end.[2] In the reign of Antoninus Pius (137-161 A. D.) Trypho told Justin Martyr[3] that all Jews believed that the Messiah would be a man born of men, and that he would be anointed by Elijah. Celsus (ca. 178 A. D.) puts his arguments against Christianity on the lips of a Jew. How far the Jew represents Celsus, rather than Celsus the Jew, is doubtful. But in the main the philosopher probably represents fairly well the average Jewish opinion of the day. This is also shown by the Targums. These Aramaic paraphrases by different interpreters no doubt give a fair idea of the opinions prevailing from the

[1] The Palestinian recension of these "Eighteen Prayers" found in a *geniza* in Cairo was published by Schechter in *Jewish Quarterly Review*, 1898, pp. 654-659. Together with the Babylonian recension it has been reprinted by Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, Leipzig, 1898, p. 299 ff., where also a number of other prayers and hymns referring to the Messiah are given.

[2] See Schmidt, *Ecclesiasticus*, 1903, pp. xxvi, xxvii, 176 ff.

[3] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, xlix.

first to the seventh century of our era. Unfortunately, it is impossible to date with accuracy the different targums. It is significant, however, that the unquestionably very late Targum Jerushalmi contains a much larger number of Messianic interpretations than Targum Onkelos,[1] among them the interesting reference to the Messiah, son of Ephraim (to Ex. xl, 11). Other sources designate him as Messiah, son of Joseph, and indicate that he will be revealed in Galilee, gather the ten tribes, fight against Gog and Magog, and die by their sword for the sin of Jeroboam,[2] or that he will be put to death and afterwards be seen by his murderers, in accordance with Zech. xii, 10.[3] The origin of this conception of two Messiahs is very obscure. Levy[4] thinks that, after the death of Simon bar Kozeba, the people were told that he had indeed been the Messiah, but only an auxiliary Messiah, the real Son of David being in the future. The suggestion of Merx[5] that the idea is intelligible only as a compromise of two different Messiah-conceptions is more likely to be corect. With Bertholdt, he thinks of the Samaritan Ta'eb, and assumes that he was the survival of a Messiah earlier than the Judaean Son of David. But of such a Messiah there is no evidence, and the Son of Joseph who is to appear in Galilee has retained no feature connecting him with the Shechemite community. Possibly the compromise was with the Ebionites, a concession made to the followers of Jesus before the final separation. "Your Messiah, Joseph's son, may indeed appear in Galilee, as

[1] 17 in *Targum Jerushalmi* to 2 in *Targum Onkelos.*

[2] Cf. *Targum* to *Canticles,* iv, 5, and the rabbinic literature quoted by L. Bertholdt, *De Christologia Judaeorum Jesu Apostolorumque aetate,* Erlangen, 1811, p. 77 ff.

[3] In the Babylonian Talmud, *Sukka,* 52a, this passage is referred to Messiah ben Joseph by R. Dosa, who lived in the second century, A. D.

[4] *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim,* III, 271.

[5] *Ein Samaritanisches Fragment über den Ta'eb oder Messias,* Leiden, 1893, p. 20.

you expect, but only to perish again because of idolatry to give place to the real Messiah, David's son." Prophecies, like Isa. viii, 23, may have forced this concession. Joseph and Ephraim being interchangeable, the complexion of the whole idea would readily change, and the formative Christian influence would be forgotten. Targum Jonathan to Zech. iv, 7, teaches that the name of the Messiah was mentioned from of old. Whether this implies a real preëxistence from eternity, is doubtful. This Targum also refers a part of the description of the Servant of Yahwe in Isa. liii to the Messiah, but the sufferings are not ascribed to him.

It was a victorious warrior and a just ruler, a king restoring independence to Israel and giving it dominion over the world, that the Jews of the Roman period prayed for and expected. The prevailing thought did not connect with him either the creation of the world or the resurrection of the dead and the final judgment, still less a redemption of mankind through vicarious suffering. Even the thought of making the conqueror of the nations, the theocratic king, Yahwe's son and vice-gerent on earth, also judge of the world was scarcely conceived under Christian influence[1] before it was finally rejected. A rigid monotheism rendered it impossible for the Jewish Messiah to become more than a man. The New Testament reveals substantially the same beliefs concerning the Messiah both on the parts of the opponents and the defenders of the Messiahship of Jesus. But in addition to these, grafted upon this stock, there appear ideas utterly foreign to the Jewish thought of the Messiah. Such are the conceptions of a suffering and atoning Saviour, a Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world, a celestial and archetypal man, medium of creation, redemption, resurrection and final judgment, a Son of God in the Greek metaphysical sense, a Philonian Logos tabernacling among men. Out of the union of all these elements the

[1] Interpolations in *En.*, xxxvii-lxxi, and possibly *Wisdom of God.*

Christ of the ecumenic creeds evolved. He had little more than the name in common with the Jewish Messiah. Neither was ever dreamed of by the men whose thoughts are revealed in the Old Testament. Both present ideals of humanity that contain elements of permanent ethical value. The Jewish Messiah did not live in vain in the hopes of those who looked for Israel's consolation; nor did he die in vain where in the life of a scattered and persecuted people he left as an heir the dream of an united human race,[1] and among earth's most progressive nations a desire for the leadership of Israel's greatest prophet.

[1] It falls outside the scope of the present study to sketch the development of the Messianic idea in Judaism from the reign of Hadrian to the present time. But it may be remarked that Jewish and Christian scholars ought to be able by this time to break the spell of a name and to accord a fair judgment to those political leaders, social reformers, mystics and prophets who from Simon bar Kozeba to Sabatai Zewi have assumed or received from others the title of the Messiah. Cf. Hamburger, article *Messiasse* in *Real-Encyklopaedie des Judentums*, and Schmidt, article *Messiah* in the *New International Encyclopaedia*. These Messianic movements should also be more closely examined in the light of similar phenomena in the East which is so prodigal with its Saoshyants, Imams, Mahdis, prophets and revealers.

CHAPTER V

THE SON OF MAN

As long as the Gospels were read in the light of the creeds, the term "son of man" was naturally understood as indicating the human nature assumed in the incarnation by the second person of the Trinity.[1] When the Biblical books began to be studied with a view to ascertaining the thought of the writers, rather than with a more or less frankly avowed purpose of discovering proof-texts for the support of an already formulated system of doctrine, a number of perplexing questions arose touching the origin, use and significance of the phrase. Did Jesus invent it as a designation of himself or find it as a Messianic title? In the former case, did he use it to intimate that he was the man *par excellence*, the ideal man, or that he was a mere man, nothing but a human being? Did he coin it as an expression of what he thought the Messiah ought to be, or as a means of distinguishing himself from the Messiah currently expected? In the latter case, was its source in the book of Daniel, or in some other place? Was it a commonly understood Messianic title, or was it known only to a few as a name of the Messiah? In either case, was there a special significance in the word "son" or did "son of man" mean only "man"?

[1] Cf. for instance one of the best Mediaeval interpreters, Nicolas de Lyra, *Biblia Sacra*, Venice, 1588, Vol. ii, p. 43, to *Matth.*, xii, 8. This passage is understood to affirm that blasphemy against Christ's humanity is not as unpardonable as that against his divinity. In *Matth.*, xvi, 13, Christ is interpreted as confessing concerning himself the humble fact of his humanity, while his disciples understood his deity. A curious gloss to "men" in *Matth.*, xvi, 13, is "*homines sunt qui de filio hominis loquuntur, Dei enim qui deitatem intelligunt.*" For a convenient summary of patristic and Mediaeval opinion see Appel, *Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu*, 1896.

Might the term have different meanings in different connections? Should the discussion be confined to the Greek form, or would it be justifiable to look for the actual Aramaic words used by Jesus, and to inquire as to the manner in which these would naturally be employed and understood?

The first of these questions to receive serious consideration seems to have been the one mentioned last, though its importance for the solution of the entire problem has not been recognized until recently. Gilbert Génébrard,[1] commenting on Matth. xii, 32, explained "son of man" as "man" and with great propriety referred to Eli's words in I Sam. ii, 25 as expressing the same sentiment. Sins against men may be pardoned, but not sins against God. Independently Hugo Grotius[2] reached the same conclusion. He also perceived that in Matth. xii, 8 the conclusion evidently must be, "Therefore man is lord even of the sabbath." Pointing to Mark ii, 28 as giving the more original connection, he showed that the argument would have no cogency, if the "son of man" were interpreted as the Messiah, and called attention to the fact that at the time Jesus had neither declared himself to be the Messiah, nor been willing to have his disciples proclaim him as such. The natural explanation he found in the Hebrew phrase *ben Adam* which simply means "man." Grotius refrained, however, from further application of the principle. A third Orientalist, Johann Adrian Bolten,[3] following the hint given by Grotius, carefully examined the use of this term in Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Samaritan and Ethiopic. His conclusion was that "son" everywhere in this connection was only a means of designating the individual of the species, and that in Matth. ix, 6, xii, 8, xii, 32 the term should be translated "man,"

[1] *De S. Trinitate libri* III, Paris, 1569, quoted by Arnold Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache*, 1895, p. 142.

[2] In *Critici Sacri*, Vol. VI, 1698, cols. 445, 446.

[3] *Der Bericht des Matthaeus von Jesu dem Messia*, Altona, 1792, quoted by A. Meyer, *l. c.* It is the merit of Arnold Meyer to have brought to light the testimony of these three Orientalists.

while in other passages it should be interpreted in the light of the Aramaic *bar nasha* as an indefinite pronoun, "one," "some one." H. E. G. Paulus,[1] as Theodore Beza[2] before him, explained "the man" to mean "this man who stands before you," a substitute for the personal pronoun "I," like the Oriental "thy servant," "thy handmaiden." O. F. Fritzsche[3] followed Paulus, but added the important suggestion that a number of passages containing the term belonged to a later time, when it had taken on a Messianic significance. Kuinoel[4] accepted the interpretation of Matth. xii, 8 given by Grotius and that of Matth. x, 23 given by Beza and Bolten.

A theory assuming that Jesus habitually used an indefinite pronoun, or a phrase like "the man," accompanied by a gesture indicating himself, instead of the simple first personal pronoun, was too artificial to command respect. The philological explanation was an apparent failure, and in the general reaction against *rationalismus vulgaris* the achievements of these earlier scholars were completely forgotten. Much work had to be done in literary and historical criticism before the argument from philology could again be profitably presented.

It was only a more modern form that Herder[5] gave to the old idea, that the term was intended to teach the human nature of Christ as distinct from his divine nature, by explaining it as a designation of the ideal humanity of Jesus. Through Schleiermacher[6] and Neander[7] this view gained a wide recognition. It was defended by C. H. Weisse,[8] H.

[1] *Theologisch-kritischer Commentar über das Neue Testament*, 1800, 1812.

[2] Quoted by Holtzmann in *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1865, p. 217.

[3] *Commentatio in Evangelium Matthaei*, p. 320.

[4] *Commentarius in libros Novi Testamenti*, 1823, I, 320.

[5] *Christliche Schriften*, II, 1796, v, 4.

[6] *Einleitung in's Neue Testament*, p. 479 f.

[7] *Das Leben Jesu*, 1837, p. 129 ff.

[8] *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1838, I, p. 325.

Holtzmann[1] and W. Beyschlag[2] from different standpoints. Weisse thought that Jesus used it to intimate that his was a higher type of humanity, hence it was to his hearers a riddle. Holtzmann held that Jesus did not find the phrase as a Messianic title but formed it as an esoteric designation for himself from Dan. vii, 13, to indicate that he was the bearer of all human dignity and human rights. Beyschlag found already in the passage in Daniel the ideal man, the preexistent, archetypal, heavenly man, and in Jesus at once the Messiah and this ideal man appearing on earth.

Against this conception of the term as claiming an emphatically high position, Christian Ferdinand Baur[3] set a diametrically different estimate. Having shown that the passages where the term occurs in the Fourth Gospel cannot throw any light on its original meaning, he examined the Synoptics with the result that he could neither find anything to suggest Dan. vii as the probable origin nor discover in the context anywhere a hint of ideal manhood. On the contrary, it seemed probable that Jesus invented this self-designation in order at the same time to claim for himself a Messiahship without which he could not attain to a more universal recognition and a genuine national work, and to keep aloof from the vulgar Messianic idea associated with the title "Son of God." In distinction from a Messiah appearing in power and glory, he would be a man deeming nothing foreign to him that belongs to the lot of a human being, identifying himself with all human conditions, needs and interests in genuine human sympathy, and accepting all sufferings and sacrifices connected with his work in life. Colani[4] maintained that the expression was unknown before

[1] *Uber den N.Tlichen Ausdruck "Menschensohn"* in *Zeitschrift für Wiss. Theologie,* 1865, p. 212 ff.

[2] *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments,* 1866, p. 9 ff.

[3] *Zeitschrift für Wiss. Theologie,* 1860, p. 274 ff. In *Neutestamentliche Theologie,* 1864, p. 82, he assumes a later Danielic significance for the eschatological discourses differing from the earlier and original.

[4] *Jésus Christ et les Croyances messianiques de son temps,* 1864, p. 74 f., 81 f.

Jesus, because it was he who created it; that by it he designated himself as a poor child of Adam, and also as the object of a particular divine love; that no one saluted him as "son of man," because this would have been almost an insult, and that it soon disappeared, because in the faith of the church the divinity had become more important than the humanity of Jesus. Like Baur, Hilgenfeld[1] regarded the expression as indicating lowly external conditions and a humble disposition as associated with the Messianic office, while he considered Dan. vii to be its source and maintained its Messianic significance in all places.

Already W. Scholten[2] and more clearly D. F. Strauss[3] had looked upon "the son of man" as simply a title of the Messiah drawn from Dan. vii without any intention of describing by it the character of the Messiah. Bernhard Weiss[4] most consistently carried out this idea. Rejecting both the "emphatically high" and the "emphatically low" conception supposed to be implied in the title, and refraining from all analysis of the phrase, he contented himself with showing that it was everywhere used as an equivalent of the Messiah. Among those who believe that Jesus actually used the phrase, this "synthetic" view has been adopted by Baldensperger.[5]

The majority of scholars continued to look to the Greek phrase itself for the solution of its mystery. But while in earlier days one fundamental meaning was assumed, various

[1] *Die Evangelien und die gesch. Gestalt Jesu* in *Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Th.*, 1863, p. 327 ff. Substantially the same view has also been expressed by Wendt, *Die Lehre Jesu*, I, 1888, p. 23 f., and in the thoughtful article of Holsten, *Zeitschr. f. Wiss. Th.*, 1891, p. 1 ff.

[2] *Specimen hermeneutico-theologicum de appellatione qua Jesus se Messiam professus est*, 1809.

[3] *Leben Jesu*, 1835, p. 463. Later Strauss changed his view under the influence of Baur.

[4] *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des N. T.*, 1868, p. 59 ff.

[5] *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu*,[2] 1892, p. 169 ff., 182 ff. It is the merit of Baldensperger to have seriously attempted to explain how Jesus as a child of his own age and a true-hearted man could have regarded himself as the Messiah. The house was well built, but its foundations were insecure and have given away completely.

combinations began to be introduced. This was quite natural. If the term was at all created by Jesus, or its content modified by him, it must reflect in some way his Messianic consciousness. Thus Carl Wittichen[1] maintained that Jesus changed the current Messianic conception of the title by infusing into it the idea of a king in a purely ethical sense, by translating it from the abstract into the concrete, by uniting with it the notion of a suffering servant of the Lord, and by introducing the thought of a second glorious presence on earth of this ideal man. C. F. Nösgen[2] saw in it, not indeed the unique and perfect man, but a combination of esoteric Messiahship suggested by Daniel, and a phase of existence through which the Messiah had to pass with its predetermined humiliation and sufferings. Schnedermann[3] combined Danielic Messiah, Ezechielic prophet, ideal man and human sufferer. And R. H. Charles[4] held that the true interpretation would be found "if we start with the conception as found in Enoch, and trace its enlargement and essential transformation in the usage of our Lord; in this transformation it is reconciled to and takes over into itself its apparent antithesis, the conception of the Servant of Jehovah, while it betrays occasional reminiscences of Dan. vii, the ultimate source of this designation."

While Colani[5] and Usteri[6] most decidedly maintained that Jesus himself was the inventor of the term, and Strauss,[7] Hausrath,[8], Vernes[9] and Weizsäcker thought of Ezechiel as its source[10], the overwhelming majority of

[1] *Die Idee des Menschen,* 1868, p. 144 ff.

[2] *Geschichte Jesu Christi,* 1891, p. 155 ff.

[3] *Jesu Verkündigung und Lehre vom Reiche Gottes,* II, 1895, p. 206 ff.

[4] *The Book of Enoch,* 1893, p. 312 ff.

[5] *l. c.*

[6] *Theologische Zeitschrift aus der Schweitz,* 1886, p. 1 ff.

[7] *l. c.*

[8] *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte,* 1879, III, p. 980.

[9] *Histoire des idées messianiques,* 1874, p. 187.

[10] This view has recently been carried out most consistently by G. L. Cary, *The Synoptic Gospels,* 1900, p. 360 ff., who rejects the idea that

scholars since the time of the Reformation have looked for its origin to Dan. vii. The exegesis of this chapter has therefore naturally had much influence on the view of the New Testament expression. In earlier times the "one like a son of man" in Dan. vii, 13 was understood by all to refer to the Messiah. Hitzig[1] recognized the impossibility of this interpretation. He regarded the man-like being as a symbol of Israel, and gave rise to the now current view that sees in it a suggestion of the humane régime, the ideal kingdom of man, that is to be established when Israel comes into power. Where this interpretation prevailed it could not but affect the view-point from which the whole question was examined. If Daniel could body forth in a symbol the notion of an ideal society, why should not Jesus have found in it the suggestion of an ideal humanity to be realized by the individual? Even more pertinent, however, would be the question, Why should he not have used the phrase in the same manner to designate the coming kingdom of heaven? S. Hoekstra,[2] W. Brückner[3] and J. Estlin Carpenter[4] affirmed that this was the sense in which Jesus had used the term. But the symbolic representation of a "humane régime," "*ein Menschheitsideal*" savors more of modern sentiments than of the concrete conceptions of Semitic antiquity, and may have been wrongly attributed to the ancient prophet. It is more likely that in this passage, as everywhere else in the book, the author meant by a being like a man appearing in the celestial realms an angel, and that the particular angel in this instance was none else than Michael,

Jesus used the term as a Messianic title and maintains that "in speaking of himself as 'the Son of Man' he intended to announce himself as a prophet sent to warn his people of the danger which threatened them if they did not turn from their evil ways."

[1] *Das Buch David,* 1850. Ibn Ezra had already explained the one like a son of man as Israel. Before Hitzig, Hofmann had also made this suggestion, *Weissagung und Erfüllung,* I, p. 209 f.

[2] *De benaming "de Zoon des Menschen,"* 1866.

[3] *Jesus "des Menschen Sohn"* in *Jahrbücher für prot. Theologie,* 1886, p. 254 ff.

[4] *The First Three Gospels,* 1890, p. 383 ff.

the representative on high of the Jewish nation.[1] At the end of the first century of our era apocalyptic writers clearly show that they understand the man on the clouds in Daniel's vision as an individual, though there is room for difference as to whether he is the Messiah[2] or some such translated hero as Enoch.[3] That Jesus said "the man (of Daniel's famous vision) will come on the clouds," when he meant "the kingdom of heaven will come," is after all quite improbable.[4]

Another way out of the difficulty was indicated by the general course of literary criticism. Through the researches of Bretschneider,[5] Strauss, Bruno Bauer and Baur an insight had been gained into the character of the Fourth Gospel that not only forbade its use as a historic source but also revealed a late growth of "son of man" passages. After the priority of Mark had been maintained by G. C. Storr,[6] C. G. Wilke[7] and C. H. Weisse,[8] the observation was made by H. Holtzmann[9] that in this Gospel Jesus does not claim for himself the Messiahship before his visit to Caesarea Philippi. This tended to put into a separate cate-

[1] Cf. Schmidt, *The "Son of Man" in the Book of Daniel* in *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, 1900, II, p. 22 ff. *Nihil sub sole novum.* Three years later I discovered in Viktor Rydberg's *Bibelns Lära om Kristus* (5th ed., 1893) a passage I had never seen, in which this Swedish savant expresses his view that the "one like a son of man" is Michael and Messiah in one person not yet separated. This is not my view, as I do not believe the Messiah is in any way referred to in this passage. But *suum cuique.* Was Rydberg the first to think of Michael in this connection?

[2] *En.*, xlvi, 2, 3, 4; xlviii, 2; lxii, 7, 9, 14; lxiii, 11; lxix, 26, 27, 29; lxx, 1; IV *Ezra*, xiii, 3 ff.

[3] *En.*, lxxi.

[4] The view, expressed by the present writer in *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, 1896, p. 51, that on one occasion Jesus used it in this sense can no longer be maintained.

[5] *Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Joannis Apostoli indole et origine*, 1820.

[6] *Von dem Zweck der evangelischen Geschichte*, 1786.

[7] *Der Urevangelist*, 1838.

[8] *Die evangelische Geschichte*, 1838.

[9] *Die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863, p. 431 ff.

gory those passages in Mark that contained the term, and yet occurred in this Gospel before the episode at Caesarea Philippi. If they could not be removed from their place,[1] they would have to be explained. But for this necessity, it is scarcely conceivable that the theory should have become so popular that has been maintained by Ritschl,[2] Holtzmann[3] and a great number of scholars, according to which Jesus used the term to half conceal and half reveal his identity, hiding it, as it were, from the mighty and wise who looked for a son of David, while suggesting it to the babes whose faith was nourished by apocalyptic visions. The obvious improbability of this conjecture was calculated to raise a question concerning the reliability of the synoptic representation. The discovery of John's untrustworthiness had led scholars to lean all the more heavily on Mark, Matthew and Luke. It is largely the merit of Bruno Bauer and Volkmar to have applied the same measure to all the Gospels, explaining each as a didactic work written for a definite purpose, and naturally reflecting the religious thought of the author and the circle of Christians where he moved. From this point of view it readily occurred first to Bauer[4] and then independently to Volkmar[5] that the title may have been a creation of Mark and that consequently Jesus may never have used it as a self-designation. The absence of the title[6] in the Pauline literature and the Apocalypse of John gave added strength to this impression. But was really Mark the originator of this expression? Colani[7] had recognized that Mark xiii, 5-32 (Matth. xxiv, 4-36, Luke xxi, 8-36) was "a veritable apocalypse lacking nothing essential to this species

[1] This was done by August Jacobsen, *Untersuchungen über die Synoptischen Evangelien*, 1883, p. 57 ff.

[2] *Theologische Jahrbücher*, 1851, p. 514.

[3] *Zeitschrift für Wiss. Th.*, 1865, p. 226.

[4] *Kritik der Evangelischen Geschichte*, III, 1842, p. 1 ff.

[5] *Die Evangelien oder Marcus und die Synopsis*, 1870, p. 197 ff.

[6] Distinguished as such by the definite article.

[7] *Jésus Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*, 1864, p. 140.

of composition." August Jacobsen[1] affirmed that this was the door through which the expression entered into the Gospels, and that it was still absent in the original form of Mark. It is in this direction also that Orello Cone[2] looked for the source of "son of man" as a Messianic title, though he still thought of Jesus as having used it to denote that he regarded himself as "the man by preëminence." Brandt's[3] position was fundamentally the same as Volkmar's. But he added the important suggestion that a recent origin and spreading influence of this apocalyptic figure would naturally explain why an evangelist should have been prompted to declare that the man coming on the cloud was none else than Jesus. In H. L. Oort's[4] dissertation on the subject, the Messianic significance of the term was strongly maintained, and its origin was sought in Daniel and the apocalypses whence it was taken by the evangelists to designate the Christian Messiah. No effort was made to trace any of the sayings containing the expression back to Jesus, and the attempt to go behind the written records was discountenanced in principle. The warning against such curiosity was repeated by Van Manen.[5] Thus a deep chasm was found between the Gospels and the actual words of Jesus over which no man could pass with any degree of assurance. The exclusive regard to the Greek gospels tended to crowd the whole question into the background, as may be seen in Wrede's important work[6] which scarcely alludes to it.

At this juncture philology stepped in again to throw a

[1] *Protestantische Kirchenzeitung*, 1886, p. 563 ff.

[2] *Jesus' Self-Designation in the Synoptics* in the *New World*, 1893, p. 492 ff.

[3] *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893, p. 562 ff. It was probably the Messianic interpretation rather than *Dan.*, vii, itself that was of recent origin, as Brandt, following Lagarde, is inclined to think.

[4] *De uitdrukking ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου in het Nieuwe Testament*, 1893.

[5] *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1894, p. 177 ff. On the other hand, J. A. Bruins, *ibid.* 646 ff., in a review of Oort's book saw a defect in this failure to look for an Aramaic origin in some instances.

[6] *Das Messiasgeheimnis*, 1901.

bridge across the gulf. Already in 1862 C. E. B. Uloth[1] had renewed the old question as to what word Jesus himself is likely to have used. His answer was that it must have been the Aramaic *bar nasha*. But this could have no meaning other than "man," "the man." Jesus consequently called himself "the man," the frail mortal. But even as such he had a right to assure his fellow men of the pardon of their sins (Matth. ix, 6). Paul de Lagarde[2] had also observed that *bar nasha* could only mean "man," and interpreted it in that sense in Matth. viii, 19 ff. Johannes Weiss[3] had returned to the exegesis of Grotius and Bolten in the case of Mark ii, 10 and ii, 28. And Wellhausen[4] had declared that the phrase Jesus used could only mean "man" and consequently imply no claim to the Messiahship. What was new in the contribution of B. D. Eerdmans[5] was a combination of Oort's general position on the meaning of the Greek term with the assertion that in three places, (Matth. xii, 8, xii, 32, xvi, 13) a Messianic significance is precluded, while in two of these, (Matth. xii, 8, 32) a recourse to the Aramaic *bar nasha* clearly indicates that Jesus spoke of man in a generic sense. Eerdmans agreed with those who could not find in *bar nasha* a Messianic title. Yet he deemed it possible that on some occasions Jesus met the desire to see in him something more than a man with a declaration that he was a man as well as they. The present writer[6] called attention to the fact that a careful critical analysis could on independent grounds admit only four genuine sayings of

[1] *De beteekenis van de uitdrukking "Zoon des Menschen," Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, 1862, p. 467 ff.

[2] *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1866, p. 26; *Deutsche Schriften*, 1878, p. 226 f., in *Gesammtausgabe Letzter Hand.*

[3] *Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes*, 1892, p. 571; *Die Nachfolge Christi*, 1895, p. 33 ff.

[4] *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*[1], 1894, p. 312.

[5] *De oorsprong van de uitdrukking "Zoon des Menschen" als evangelische Messiastitel, Th. Tijdschrift*, 1894, p. 153 ff. Cf. *ibid.*, 1895, p. 49 ff.

[6] *Was bar nasha a Messianic Title?* in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1896, p. 36 ff.

Jesus containing this term before the episode at Caesarea Philippi, and that in each of these the generic sense of "man" was most suitable; that an utterance such as "man must pass away" may have given rise to the peculiar form of the prediction of his death; that *bar nasha* cannot have been understood as a Messianic title either in Daniel, Enoch, Ezra, or the Aramaic source of the *logia*, while through the Greek translation of the Synoptic apocalypse it may have found its way as a Messianic title into the Greek Gospels. In a discussion of the mother-tongue of Jesus, Arnold Meyer[1] briefly indicated his belief that in Mark ii, 28, ii, 10 and Matth. xii, 32 an original *bar nasha* meaning "man" was used; that in Matth. viii, 20 it stood for "I," and that in Matth. xi, 9 it should be translated "some one." The discussion of the eschatological passages he deferred to a second part of his work, which has not yet appeared.[2] The value of Lietzmann's contribution lay chiefly in his careful study of early Christian literature which led him to surmise that the Greek title may have originated in Asia Minor between the death of Paul and the year 90 A. D., as acquaintance with it appears for the first time in Marcion.[3] In regard to the use of *bar nasha* by Jesus Lietzmann reached substantially the same conclusion as Eerdmans, the

[1] *Jesu Muttersprache*, 1896, pp. 91 ff., 140 ff.

[2] From *Die Moderne Forschung über die Geschichte des Christentums*, 1898, p. 75, and *Th. Lit. Zeitung*, 1898, col. 272, it may be inferred that Meyer deems it possible that in some eschatological passages the phrase "the coming of the Son of Man" actually used by Jesus was identical with the "coming of the kingdom."

[3] *Der Menschensohn*, 1896. Lietzmann's lexical collations rendered good service. Some of the forms were more accurately explained by Wellhausen. Why 90 A. D.? Even if Harnack's conjecture (*Chronologie Altchr. Lit.*, 1897, p. 298 ff.), based on an obscure and manifestly corrupt passage in Clement of Alexandria, were more trustworthy than that of Lipsius, who placed Marcion's birth at least twenty years later, and Tertullian's statement that he was a bishop's son more reliable than Megethius's that he was himself a bishop (cf. H. U. Meyboom, *Marcion en de Marcionieten*, 1888, p. 34 ff.), is there a shred of evidence that Marcion as a child was familiar with the gospel he quoted in Rome after 140 A. D.?

present writer, and Meyer. Wellhausen[1] indicated his acceptance of the new view, and subsequently gave a more extended statement of his reasons. Pfleiderer[2] also recognized the correctness of this position; Marti[3] adopted it, with the suggestion that Mark xiii, 26 may have given occasion for putting the expression as a Messianic title on the lips of Jesus. Bevan[4] ably defended it, Nöldeke[5] indicated his approval, and Staerk[6] combined it with Wrede's position.

This view has naturally met with considerable opposition. Van Manen, Hilgenfeld, Gunkel, Krop, Schmiedel, Dalman, Baldensperger, Klöpper, Clemen, Charles, Rhees, Drummond, Stevens, Fiebig and Driver have urged objections and indicated difficulties. Against the tendency to assume a genuine utterance of Jesus back of every saying in the Synoptic Gospels attributed to him, and to forget the peculiar character and manifestly late origin of these writings, Van Manen's[7] protest is quite legitimate. But since even within the Synoptics it is so often possible to trace a growth from a simpler form to one unquestionably colored by later thought, the investigator certainly has the right to assume that this development did not begin in our present Gospels. By testing a certain word in an approximation to the Aramaic form it must have had if uttered by Jesus an entirely different sense is not seldom suggested, that may readily have been obscured by a natural mistake in translation or an equally natural doctrinal bias. The more foreign to the thought of the evangelists the sentiment thus revealed proves to be, the more importance must evidently be attached to it. Schmiedel[8] is unquestionably right in laying down

[1] *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*[3], 1897, p. 381; *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, 1899, p. 187 ff.

[2] *New World*, 1899, p. 444 ff.

[3] *Das Buch Daniel*, 1901, p. 53.

[4] *Critical Review*, 1899, p. 148 ff.

[5] Quoted by Drummond in *Journal of Theol. Studies*, 1901.

[6] *Prot. Monatshefte*, 1902, p. 297 ff.

[7] *l. c.*

[8] *Protestantische Monatshefte*, 1898, p. 307.

the principle that "absolute credibility should be accorded to that which cannot have been invented by a tradition replete with veneration for Jesus because contradicting it, and most clearly in instances where among the evangelists themselves one or another has actually effected a transformation out of reverence for Jesus." This principle is perfectly sound, as every historian knows. It has been applied by the present writer in his study of the life of Jeremiah,[1] and will find the fullest recognition in his treatment of the life of Jesus. But why this should have led to a protest against the recourse to the vernacular of Jesus is difficult to understand. This acute critic has, strangely enough, failed to perceive that, if the interpretation based on the Aramaic is admitted, the passages in question furnish some exceedingly valuable illustrations of his principle.

If we turn to the four passages that report sayings of Jesus previous to his visit to Caesarea Philippi, we first meet his assertion that *bar nasha, i. e.*, man, has a right to pardon sin, (Mark ii, 10). The question in debate is whether a man can assure his fellow-man that his sins are pardoned. Jesus has said, "Child, thy sins are forgiven!" The Pharisees maintain that God alone can forgive sins. There is no hint that they thought he was exercising Messianic functions, and there is absolutely no evidence that the Jews expected the Messiah to forgive sins.[2] Jesus affirms that man has the power to pardon sins. This thought finds expression again, when Jesus enjoins upon his disciples to exercise this authority, this blessed privilege of assuring their fellow-men of the pardon of their sins when their disposition should justify them in doing so (Matth. xviii, 18). This simple assurance of forgiveness, flowing from a living faith in a heavenly Father's love, was to Jesus no sacerdotal act. Any man had a right to do it. This was a thought too bold for the early

[1] *Jeremiah* in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

[2] Scholars who quote Bertholdt's *Christologia Judaeorum*, 1811, p. 165 ff., should read the remarkable paragraph on the bearing of the penalties of sins by the Messiah. All the proof-texts that refer to the doctrine at all are taken from the New Testament.

church to grasp. More congenial was the idea that the Christ could pardon sins. The church asked, "Who is the man that can pardon sins?" and she answered, "Christ." It was no doubt because the Greek translator, following the custom of the Alexandrian version, rendered the phrase literally "the son of man" rather than in good idiomatic Greek, "the man," which in English would be simply "man," that the saying was preserved at all. It is not necessary to suppose that this utterance was originally connected with a case of healing, and therefore quite irrelevant to ask whether Jesus thought that all men could exercise healing power, even if it were easier than it is to answer such a question. Wellhausen rightly observes that the emphasis is not on man but on may.[1]

Mark ii, 23 ff, presents an even clearer case. The disciples have been eating corn as they passed through the field, and are accused of not keeping the sabbath. Jesus does not seem to have eaten: the accusation is against his disciples. But he defends them by quoting the example of David. David ate of the shewbread that, according to the law, he had no right to eat, and gave his followers permission to do so. The point is not that David and "his greater son" may take liberties with God's law which would be wrong for others, but clearly that so godly a man as David recognized that the sustenance of life was in God's eyes more important than the maintenance of the temple service. Lest this should be misinterpreted, he adds, according to Matth. xii, another argument. The law permits the priests to work on the sabbath, thus regarding the commanded cessation of labor as less important than the maintenance of divine worship. The thought is not that he and his had priestly rights, for they had none, and Jesus had no interest in the sacrificial cult, as the next statement shows. But even from the standpoint of the law there were things more important than the enjoined cessation of work. The whole sacrificial system was, in his judgment, of less significance than the principle of love violated in this charge preferred against the innocent.

[1] *l. c.*, p. 203.

Institutions have their value only as they serve man's good. Man was not made for the sabbath, but the sabbath for man; therefore man is also lord of the sabbath. The Aramaic words cannot have conveyed any other sense than this, and this alone is relevant to the argument.

There is no cogency in the argument, "Man was not made for the sake of the sabbath, but the sabbath for the sake of man, therefore the Messiah has authority over the sabbath." Even on the assumption that by the expression "son of man" Jesus had from the beginning of his ministry claimed to be the Messiah, and had been understood by his enemies to do so, an assumption that Schmiedel does not share,[1] there would be no force in this reasoning. If it were necessary to prove that the Messiah might break the law or authorize his disciples to do so, how could so startling a proposition be established by the general consideration that the sabbath was made for man's sake? There is, indeed, no evidence that the Jews expected their Messiah to violate or abrogate the divinely given law. The very suggestion would probably have produced a shock. If Jesus really desired to convince his hearers that the Messiah had a right to dispense from obedience to the law, and that he was the Messiah, he must have understood that what was needed for that purpose was a reference to a recognized Messianic passage ascribing such powers to the Messiah, or a firmly rooted tradition to this effect, and a straightforward presentation and vindication of his claims, all the more indispensable if he did not wish his Messiahship to be taken in a political sense. Were it possible that the Aramaic word he used for "son of man" could have been interpreted as a Messianic title, the impression left on the Pharisees would, after all, be that he had defended law-breaking on the ground that regard for the lower, the sabbath, must yield to regard for the higher, man, and had made such a sweeping application of a general principle, true enough in certain circumstances, to himself and followers as would allow any man to set aside any ordinance of God.

[1] *l. c.*, p. 296.

But Schmiedel thinks that Jesus may have been led to regard himself as the Messiah by the practical question that he, as a reformer, was forced to meet, whether the validity of the law might be set aside. "The law was intended to remain forever. If it must be changed, an explicit authorization by God was of course necessary. No prophet had possessed this. It was on the whole conceivable only in connection with the new order of the world, the coming of the Messianic age. Consequently only one could be the divine messenger who would dare to announce it, the Messiah."[1] This ingenious line of reasoning rests on presuppositions that are untenable. Jesus probably believed that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch. Yet he found in the prophetic rolls the most pointed criticism of the cult. Prophets had in the name of God spoken against sacrifices, temples, sabbaths and other ordinances of the law. The entire evangelic tradition shows that Jesus was deeply influenced by the prophets, but can at no time have had any great interest in the law. To a lawyer of the Pharisaic party the question of the validity of the codes might seem one of life and death; the carpenter of Nazareth lived in another world of thought. To draw a picture of Jewish society in general at the beginning of our era from the discussion of lawyers in the Talmuds is not only to read back later ideas and conditions into an earlier age, but to do injustice by a false generalization to a national life that freely developed in many directions.[2] Whether there was any relation between the Essenes and Jesus or not, the fact is significant that these most pious members of the nation did not regard it necessary to wait for a Messiah to authorize a remarkably free attitude toward the law and the temple service. It is doubtful whether the process had more than begun in the

[1] *l. c.*, p. 301.

[2] In addition to this false generalization, there often appears a shockingly one-sided and unjust estimate of the type of religious life revealed by Rabbinic literature. This sectarianism, which can only be overcome by a sounder historic method and a long training in objective yet sympathetic treatment of different religious phenomena, still disfigures many a work of great erudition and liberal tendencies.

days of Jesus, by which the religious books read in the synagogue were reduced into a canon through the exclusion of the rolls that a majority of scholars did not consider as rendering the hands "unclean."[1] Galilee was notorious for what was regarded in Jerusalem as laxer conceptions. The man of Nazareth who went forth from his carpenter's bench, as Amos of old from his sycamore trees, to prophesy unto Israel is not likely to have scrupled to follow the example of the prophets that were before him until he could persuade himself that he was, or was destined to become in the future, the Messiah some of his countrymen looked for. But this view of the sabbath that put it wholly into the hands of man was too radical for the church. By the unfortunate, though probably unintentional, mistranslation of *bar nasha,* she gained the comforting thought that the Christ was lord of the sabbath, and would no doubt lend his authority to any change made in his honor.[2] The more natural this thought is, the more value must be attached to the earlier and so markedly different form revealed by the translation back into the original Aramaic.

Matth. viii, 19 ff relates how a scribe came to Jesus and said: "Master, I will follow thee whithersoever thou goest." Jesus answered: "The foxes have holes, and the birds of the heavens nests, but *bar nasha, i. e.,* man, has nowhere to lay his head." Man's life is full of danger and uncertainty. Where will he reside to-morrow? The beast is not deprived of home and hearth by his convictions. The saying may be a proverb quoted by Jesus, or an epigram coined on the spot. No doubt the scribe saw quickly the hint, without the thought ever crossing his mind that the Galilean teacher had in the same breath announced himself as the Messiah, and had complained that, though he was so great a man, he neither owned a house nor had a place in which to lodge over night.

[1] Cf. Schmidt, *Bible Canon, Critical View* in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* and *Bible Canon* in the *New International Encyclopaedia.*

[2] This feeling still voices itself in some modern apologies for the change from the seventh to the first day.

Of more importance is Matth. xii, 32. The enemies of Jesus charged him with performing his cures by the aid of Beelzebul. In this he saw a blasphemy, because he felt that his success in curing the sick was due to the spirit of God that had come upon him; yet he was careful to distinguish between an attack upon a fellow man and a denunciation of the spirit that operated in him, saying: "If any one speaks against *bar nasha, i. e.*, man,[1] that may be pardoned him, but he that speaks against the holy spirit can have no pardon." No one in the audience could have understood him to say: "You may blaspheme the Messiah with impunity, but not the Holy Ghost." The distinction is clearly between the divine spirit and the human instrumentality. The general principle, that under all circumstances a man should be willing to forgive what is said against him by his fellow man, put no emphasis upon the maligned speaker. To the church it was quite a different thing to speak against an ordinary man from speaking against the Christ. The spirit that possessed Jesus was evidently to himself an objective reality. From this divine spirit he distinguished himself. For it he cherished the utmost reverence. That any one should have called this mysterious, energizing, beatifying prophetic spirit Beelzebul filled him with horror. How could such a sin be pardoned? The more difficult it was for the church thus to distinguish between the man Jesus and the divine spirit that, according to his view, dwelt in all God's children, the more probable is the earlier form that comes to view in the Aramaic original. It is possible that words uttered on two occasions have been put together in Matthew's account.

Matth. xvi, 13 is a conflate reading. The Sinaitic Syriac has a more original form, "What do men say concerning me? that is Who is this son of man?" "This" may be set to the account of the Aramaic translator, as Schmiedel has suggested. "Who is the son of man?" may then be a later

[1] On the basis of a reading that Marcion seems to have had, Wellhausen suggests as the original "whatever is said by a man," "all that man says," *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, p. 204.

interpolation in the Greek text. To the mind of the interpolator Jesus had already designated himself as the Messiah by the term Son of Man. But the answer in the text seemed to him to give a fuller insight into the nature of the Messiah. He was to him the Son of God in a deeper sense. To this extent Van Manen is probably right.

As to the remarkable silence concerning this title in early Christian literature outside of the Gospels, it can in most instances neither be affirmed nor denied that it is due to ignorance. But it is difficult to escape the impression that its absence in the Johannine apocalypse[1] indicates that it had not yet appeared as a Messianic title when in the reign of Domitian[2] this book was written. Acts vii, 56 shows that at a somewhat later date a Christian writer did not hesitate to put the title upon the lips of the proto-martyr when speaking of Jesus.[3]

Hilgenfeld[4] has called attention to a translation by Jerome[5] of a passage in his Hebrew Gospel, where he read that Jesus after his resurrection "took a bread, blessed, brake it and gave it to James the Just, saying: 'my brother, eat thy bread because the son of man has risen from those that sleep.'" The question is, what Aramaic word Jerome rendered by *filius hominis*. Hilgenfeld thinks it may have been *bereh de nasha*. Thus the Edessene Christians attempted to render the Greek title. But this awkward if

[1] In *Rev.*, i, 13, and xiv, 14, the term lacks the article.

[2] Cf. the convincing arguments of Harnack, *Chronologie d. Alt. Lit.*, 1897, p. 245 ff. That earlier material was used is as evident as that there are many additions that belong to the second century.

[3] Schmiedel has also expressed a desire for a more exhaustive presentation of the renderings of "man" and "Son of Man" in the different Syriac versions of the Bible. Such a survey, as complete as the absence of a concordance permits, correcting some unfortunate errors made by Driver, Lietzmann and others and raising some new and interesting problems, not, however, affecting the main question, will be found in my article *Son of Man*, in Vol. IV, of the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

[4] *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift*, 1897, p. 1520 ff.

[5] *De viris illust.*

not ungrammatical[1] form was only created by the dire necessity of translating a Greek expression for which there was no idiomatic Aramaic equivalent, because it was itself a slavishly literal rendering of an Aramaic phrase that meant simply "man," and under no circumstances could be a title. The saying is not genuine and throws no light on the subject, except that it would show how little Christian writers among the Ebionites hesitated to put the phrase into the mouth of Jesus, as Lietzmann has well pointed out,[2] if we could be sure that the original reading of the Hebrew Gospel has been preserved. But this is far from certain, as another variant exists.[3]

Against the fundamental assumption of all Semitic scholars who had dealt with the subject, that at the time of Jesus *bar nasha* was the designation of "man" in Galilean Aramaic, a protest was entered by Gustaf Dalman.[4] He pointed out that this phrase does not occur in Biblical Aramaic, the Palmyrene and Nabataean inscriptions, Targum Onkelos, and the Samaritan Targum to the Pentateuch, and maintained that *bar nasha* was an innovation in the later Galilean and Christian Palestinian literature brought in from Edessa. Bevan[5] replied, that in the Targums the translators simply showed their usual tendency to retain the Hebrew idiom; that the occasions for using the phrase in the inscriptions were naturally few; that the various uses of *enash* and *bar enash* which appear concurrently in Syriac are all found in one or another of the Palestinian dialects, and that no Palestinian dialect employs any of these forms in a sense unknown in Syriac. Wellhausen[6] found it not incredible that the distinctive term for "man," "the human being," should have been lacking here and there, but

[1] Cf. Wellhausen, *Der Syrische Evangelienpalimpsest vom Sinai*, 1895, p. 12, but also Schmidt in *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, 1896, p. 46.

[2] *l. c.*, p. 10.

[3] See Schmidt, *"Son of Man"* in *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

[4] *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898, p. 191 ff.

[5] *Critical Review*, 1899, p. 148 ff.

[6] *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, VI, p. v ff.

pointed to Dan. vii, 13, the Evangeliarium, and the Targum and Talmud edited in Galilee as evidence of its existence in Palestine, and considered as arbitrary the conjecture that it was due to Edessene influence. Dalman no doubt has indicated a real tendency of Aramaic speech in this respect; but the older Palestinian literature is too slight to show at what time the definite appellative came into more common use, and there is a strong presumption in favor of its earlier appearance in Galilee. It is significant that Dalman himself can find no other phrase than *bar nasha* likely to have been used by Jesus. The idea that he employed this expression, not in the ordinary sense that it has in all Aramaic dialects where it occurs, and in all the literary remains of the Galilean dialect, but as an innovation to designate himself as "the human being weak by nature that God will make lord of the world," lacks every semblance of plausibility. Even according to Dalman Jesus used the term *bar nasha;* and he has well shown that this cannot be proved to be a Messianic title either from Enoch, IV Ezra, or any other source.

The authority of so accomplished a student of Palestinian Aramaic as Dalman naturally influenced scholars unprepared to pass an independent judgment. Baldensperger[1] voiced his premature rejoicing over the final defeat of the philological explanation, and hinted at undue philosophical prepossessions. Rush Rhees[2] excused himself from considering the arguments presented by the present writer on the ground that "Schmidt is manifestly hampered by the prejudgment that Jesus cannot have made for himself at the outset any supernatural claims." This was not the case. The only prejudgment was that Jesus did not speak Greek, and that it was incumbent on the student of the Gospels to use all available means to find out what he actually said. At the outset it seemed altogether likely that the teaching, conduct, and tragic fate of Jesus could be best accounted for on the assumption that he regarded himself as the Messiah,

[1] *Theologische Rundschau,* 1900, p. 201 ff.
[2] *Journal of Bib. Lit.,* XVII, 96.

and made for himself such supernatural claims as this position implied. On *a priori* grounds it is difficult to see why it should not have been as possible for Jesus to make such claims as for a Simon bar Kozeba. It would have been an easier road to travel than the narrow path he trod. That he rose above even the desire to become a righteous king, a world-conquering Messiah, can be explained only by his peculiar moral disposition and his supreme religious genius. But this result of a long series of investigations was wholly unexpected.

Charles's translation of the Book of Enoch unintentionally led a number of scholars into confusion. To argue from even the best of translations is always a hazardous undertaking. As much stress was laid on the demonstrative pronoun "this" or "that," the present writer called attention to the fact that the demonstrative is often used in the Ethiopic for the lacking definite article, and that therefore "this son of man" may be the rendering of a Greek "the son of man."[1] Charles[2] has subsequently shown a number of instances in Enoch of this usage, and drawn the conclusion that the Greek text had everywhere "the son of man" as a Messianic title. But a more careful discrimination may be necessary. It is generally assumed that the book of Enoch was translated from the Greek into Ethiopic by a Christian. If so, it is very strange that he should indicate the article by a demonstrative when the translation of the New Testament had never done so in the case of "the son of man."[3] Not less peculiar would it be that he should not have used uniformly the term *walda eguala emahyau* ("son of the offspring of the mother of the living"), invariably employed in the Gospels, but as often other terms. It is not impossible, however, that the book was translated by a Jew before Christianity was introduced. This would

[1] *Journal of Bib. Lit.*, 1896, p. 48.

[2] *A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life*, 1899, p. 214 f.

[3] Flemming in Lietzmann, *Zur Menschensohnfrage*, 1899, p. 5. My own collation corroborates that of Flemming on this point.

account for its place in the Jewish canon as well as in the Christian.[1] In that case the same freedom would be natural as that obtaining in the Old Testament. All passages containing the distinctive form of the expression in the Ethiopic Gospels may then have been retouched by Christian copyists. But did the Greek text read "this son of man" or "the son of man"? The latter is possible. But is it probable? That depends upon what form the translator into Greek found in his Aramaic original, and what his own faith was. If he was a Christian, familiar with the Gospels, and convinced that none else than the Christ was referred to, he may have written "the son of man," whether the Aramaic had a demonstrative or not. If he was a Jew, which is more probable, he would naturally think of Daniel's "son of man," and the *ille homo* of IV Ezra xiii, 12, suggests that he may have read "the son of man," *bar nasha* with a demonstrative. It is difficult to think through En. xlvi in the Aramaic without being impressed with the naturalness of the demonstrative. "I saw one like a man;" "I asked in regard to that man;" "he answered: this is the man who has righteousness;" "this man whom thou hast seen will arouse the kings . . . from their thrones." This is evidently in good order. "In that hour that man was named before the Lord of Spirits" (xlviii, 2) follows naturally. Toward the end of the book it is more difficult to determine where the Greek translator may have found a *bar nasha* in his Aramaic text. That in the original "son of man" occurred as a Messianic title, is impossible to affirm, and altogether improbable.

The most serious objection of Krop[2] is derived from the presence of the title in predictions of Jesus' death and resurrection. How was the title brought from the eschatological series into so different a setting? It may be answered that when once utterances concerning the coming of the son of man had been placed on the lips of Jesus, and the expression

[1] Cf. the account of James Bruce in Richard Lawrence's editio princeps *Libri Enoch prophetae versio Aethiopica*, 1838, p. xi.

[2] *La pensée de Jésus sur le royaume de dieu*, 1897.

consequently understood as a self-designation it may readily have been substituted for "I," as the vacillating tradition in many places indicates, and adopted in the creation of new oracles. It is probable that Jesus actually said, when the prophet's death began to appear to him as a possible issue of his career: "man must pass away" (Mark xiv, 21) and added: "but he will rise again" (Mark ix, 31), as he no doubt believed in a resurrection of the dead, though his conception of it seems to have approached the Essene idea (Mark xii, 26, 27). Translated into Greek, such a saying would almost inevitably have been interpreted as referring to Jesus himself exclusively.

Gunkel's[1] opposition comes from his strong conviction that "the man" is a mythological figure of Babylonian origin. So far as the personality is concerned to whom Daniel, Enoch and Ezra refer, he is no doubt right in assuming an ultimate Babylonian origin. The conflict between Marduk and Tiamat became in Judaism a conflict between Yahwe and the great chaos-monster. What was first ascribed to Yahwe himself was subsequently assigned to an angel. This angel was Michael. After the destruction of the beast this celestial representative of Israel in Dan. vii comes with the clouds to receive the world-empire.[2] The

[1] *Zeitschrift für Wiss. Theologie,* 1899. p. 581 ff. *Das Vierte Buch Esra* in Kautzsch, *Pseudepigraphen,* 1900, p. 347. Gunkel is quite right in his contention that religious ideas in general, and particularly eschatological conceptions, occurring only sporadically and by way of allusion in extant literature, may have lived quite a flourishing life in the thoughts of men and may have had their origin in Oriental mythology. But it must not be forgotten that a possibility is by no means a necessity, that for certain knowledge we are wholly dependent upon the literary remains, that, when these indicate a development of thought, a corresponding growth is likely to have taken place in the social *milieu* whence these expressions come, and that it is safer to err on the side of a too conservative clinging to the literary documents than by giving too free reins to speculations as to what may have come down from immemorial times ("uralt") or from foreign mythology.

[2] Marti, in a friendly note to the author, suggests as a difficulty against supposing Michael to be meant that one would expect the other nations in that case to be likewise represented by their angels,

development of the Messianic idea led to a transfer of these functions to the Messiah. But that the celestial being described, as every other angel, as having the appearance of a man, had for his proper name "the human being," lacks all probability. Hommel[1] has called attention to the interesting fact that Adapa, the human counterpart of Marduk, is spoken of as *zir amiluti* ("seed of men"). But how *zir amiluti* can mean "he from whose seed the whole of mankind is sprung" is as difficult to understand as how "spring of mankind" could possibly be the equivalent of "son of man." The plain meaning of *zir amiluti* is "offspring of human parents," and there is no intimation that this was a title, or that Adapa was the first man.

It is important, however, to bear in mind the celestial origin of this figure. Beings in human shape that move about among the clouds or at the confines of the deep are not men but angels. In Dan. viii, 15 the angel Gabriel is introduced as "one having the appearance of a man;" in x, 16 he is like "the sons of men;" in iii, 25 "four men" are referred to, yet one of them is like "a son of the gods;" in ix, 21 the angel is referred to as "the man Gabriel," and so again in x, 5, xii, 6, 7. In Rev. xiv, 14 "like a son of man" is manifestly a rendering of *kebar enash* of Dan. vii, 13, yet it is, as the next verse shows, a designation of an angel; in En. lxxxvii, 2 the four archangels are all "like white men." The impression left upon an ancient reader of Dan. vii, En. xlvi, IV Ezra xiii, Rev. i, or the Synoptic apocalypse was

but deems it necessary to put more emphasis than has been done on the "celestial, angelic character of Israel." However, if the mythical origin is admitted, that would explain the form. The violation of the chaos-monster by Yahwe (or his representative) was a familiar thought; so also the identification of the chaos-monster with a heathen world-power. The slaying of an angel would be quite a different thing. Daniel speaks with evident shyness about the great angels of Persia and of Greece. The more earnestly it is attempted to make an angel out of Israel, the more difficult it will become to avoid the conclusion that Israel's angel is meant.

[1] *The Expository Times*, May, 1900, p. 341 ff. A. Jeremias had already briefly suggested the comparison in Roscher's *Lexicon d. griech. und röm. Mythologie*, III, 586.

that of an occupant of the celestial world, not of a frail mortal. This meets the weightiest objection of Drummond,[1] that the church would have preferred to invent some higher title. If Jesus used the term *bar nasha,* as no Semitic scholar doubts, he can have been understood to mean by it only "man" in general. In the passages that on independent grounds are most likely to be genuine it can have been intended to mean nothing else. When the church identified him with the Danielic "son of man," it applied to him a high title. Daniel's celestial being was no ordinary man.

That Jesus chose to call himself "the man" in order to show that he was the man of Daniel's vision, rather than the "son of David" or Messiah expected by the people, as Kloepper[2] seems to think, is well nigh inconceivable. What moral qualities does Daniel's "man" possess? What ethical content could men have given to the conception of one whose appearance meant to them the establishment of the empire of the Jews that was not also given to the current Messianic ideal? Clemen[3] asks why *bar nasha* cannot have been a Messianic title at the time of Jesus as well as later. The answer is obvious. There is not the slightest evidence that *bar nasha* ever was used as a Messianic title. There is reason to believe that on some occasions Jesus used it in the sense it commonly and exclusively has in extant Aramaic literature. In these instances it has been wrongly translated in the Greek gospels by a title apparently not yet drawn from the book of Daniel when Revelation and Fourth Ezra were written in the reign of Domitian.

But Stevens[4] thinks that "the positive and abundant evidence of the Gospels to the effect that Jesus used 'the son of man' (or its equivalent) to designate an official peculiarity (to claim no more) of his person and work is not to be set aside by mere conjectures as to the supposed use of Aramaic words." One who reads without critical consider-

[1] *Journal of Theological Studies,* July, 1901, p. 539 ff.
[2] *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie,* 1899, p. 161 ff.
[3] *Theologische Literatur-Zeitung,* 1899, col. 489.
[4] *The Teaching of Jesus,* 1901, p. 91.

ations the four Greek gospels and observes that the term occurs not less than eighty-one times[1] is naturally impressed

[1] As it is of some importance to know which of these occur in three, in two, or only in one of the gospels, the following arrangement may be made for convenience sake, involving no judgment as to the number of times, or separate occasions, when the evangelists considered Jesus as having used the expression. Eight in *Matth.*, *Mark*, and *Luke:*

1. *Matth.*, ix, 6	*Mark*, ii, 10	*Luke*, v, 24
2. " xii, 8	" ii, 28	" vi, 5
3. " xvi, 27	" viii, 38	" ix, 26
4. " xvii, 22*a*	" ix, 31	" ix, 44
5. " xx, 18	" x, 33	" xviii, 31
6. " xxiv, 30*b*	" xiii, 26	" xxi, 27
7. " xxvi, 24*a*	" xiv, 21	" xxii, 22
8. " xxvi, 64	" xiv, 62	" xxii, 69

Five in *Matth.* and *Mark:*

9. *Matth.*, xvii, 9	*Mark*, ix, 9
10. " xvii, 12	" ix, 12
11. " xx, 28	" x, 45
12. " xxvi, 24b	" xiv, 21b
13. " xxvi, 45	" xiv, 41

Eight in *Matth.* and *Luke:*

14. *Matth.*, viii, 20	*Luke*, ix, 58
15. " xi, 19	" vii, 34
16. " xii, 32	" xii, 10*a*
17. " xii, 40	" xi, 30
18. " xxiv, 27	" xvii, 24
19. " xxiv, 37	" xvii, 26
20. " xxiv, 39	" xvii, 30
21. " xxiv, 44	" xii, 40

One in *Mark* and *Luke:*

22. *Mark*, viii, 31 — *Luke*, ix, 2

Nine in *Matth.* alone:

23. *Matth.*, x, 23	28. *Matth.*, xix, 28
24. " xiii, 37	29. " xxiv, 30*a*
25. " xiii, 41	30. " xxv, 31
26. " xvi, 13	31. " xxvi, 2
27. " xvi, 28	

Eight in *Luke* alone:

32. *Luke*, vi, 22	36. *Luke*, xix, 10
33. " xii, 8	37. " xxi, 36
34. " xvii, 22	38. " xxii, 48
35. " xviii, 8	39. " xxiv, 7

In the fourth Gospel it occurs twelve times, viz.: i, 51; iii, 13, 14 (v. 27), vi, 27, 53, 62; viii, 28; ix, 35; xii, 23, 34 *a b;* xiii, 31.

with "the positive and abundant evidence" of its use. But the moment he begins to compare the different gospels and examine their peculiarities the number becomes at once less significant. If he understands at all the character of the Fourth Gospel, he knows that the twelve instances in which the term is used in it only indicate the familiarity of its author with the Synoptics, or the occurrence of the title in Asia Minor a century after the time of Jesus. It is quite impossible to read the sixty-nine passages in the Synoptics without seeing that there are numerous parallels. Driver[1] removes twenty-nine and looks upon forty as representing as many distinct utterances by Jesus. But this procedure, simple as it is, implies a criticism that cannot stop there. For if the doublets and triplets are examined it is manifest that, though there is sufficient agreement to show a purpose to report the same saying, verbal accuracy may not be expected, and a choice must be made on grounds of probability. It is also seen that in the case of seventeen passages found only in Matthew or in Luke, some are clearly duplicates of sayings already recorded within these gospels, others have synoptic parallels in which the phrase does not occur, and others still are manifestly later glosses. Thus Matthew x, 23, which is not found in the parallel passage, Luke xii, 11 f., reflects the missionary ideas and hopes of the Jewish-Christian Church. The allegorical interpretation of the parable of the tares in Matth. xiii, 37-41 is clearly from the hand of the evangelist. The account in Matth. xvi, 13-20 has evidently suffered from later expansions, such as "the Son of the living God" in vs. 16, the pontifical diploma in vss. 17-19, and the second question, "Who is this son of man" added to the query, "What do men say concerning me?" in our oldest witness to the text, the Sinaitic Syriac. In Matth. xvi, 28, the Son of Man coming in his kingdom has probably taken the place of "the kingdom of heaven," as is suggested by Luke ix, 27, where "the kingdom of God" occurs, and Mark ix, 1, which reads "the kingdom of God

[1] Article *Son of Man* in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary.*

already come with power." A comparison of Matth. xix, 28 f. with Mark x, 29 and Luke xviii, 29 shows that each evangelist has considerably modified the original utterance, which probably had "for the sake of the kingdom of heaven." If "the sign of the son of man" in Matth. xxiv, 30a had formed a part of the original apocalypse, it would no doubt have been preserved by Mark and Luke. Matth. xxv, 31 is plainly of very late origin, as is the parable itself, reflecting the existence of the Church among the heathen nations, and proclaiming the doctrine that the pagans are to be judged according to their treatment of the Christians. In Matth. xxvi, 2 the statement of a fact (Mark xiv, 1 f., Luke xxii, 1 f.) has been changed into a prophecy. In Luke vi, 22 the phrase "for my sake," itself a late addition in Matth. v, 11, has been changed into "for the sake of the son of man." Similarly "I" in Matth. x, 32, itself secondary, has been transformed into "son of man" in Luke xii, 8. Luke xvii, 20-22 is not in harmony with what follows and the disenchantment of the Church is clearly indicated in vs. 22. Luke xviii, 8b expresses the same disappointment as regards the second coming, as Juelicher[1] has pointed out. Luke xix, 10 is a homeless fragment, interpolated here as in Matth. xviii, 11, but contains a beautiful tribute to Jesus. Wernle[2] rightly regards Luke xxi, 34-36 as an exhortation by the evangelist himself. The same judgment is, with good reason, passed upon Luke xxii, 48 by Holtzmann.[3] In Matth. xxvi, 50 the text is scarcely sound. Luke xxii, 48 may go back to an Aramaic question, "Is it with a kiss that thou betrayest a man *(bar nash)?*" But the tradition is very uncertain, as the parallel passage shows. In Luke xxvii, 7 two men in dazzling raiment, evidently angels, remind the women that Jesus had predicted his death and resurrection. Speeches made by angels are not regarded by historians as belonging to their proper field. But it is interesting to observe that the quotation made by the angel

[1] *Gleichnisreden Jesu,* 1899, II, p. 288.
[2] *Die Synoptische Frage,* 1899, p. 17.
[3] *Hand Commentar,* 2nd ed., 1901, p. 414.

does not quite correspond to any prediction recorded in the gospel. So little did Luke care about accuracy. It is impossible to study even these passages occurring only in one gospel without being impressed with the freedom with which sayings of Jesus were modified as they passed from lip to lip and new ones were created.

Among the eight passages found only in Matth. and Luke, Matth. viii, 20 (Lk ix, 58), xi, 19 (vii, 34), and xii, 32a (xii, 10a) probably go back to original sayings of Jesus, as we have seen; xii, 40 (xi, 30) is an interpolation, as is generally recognized; xxiv, 27, 37, 39 (xvii, 24, 26, 30) belong to the Synoptic Apocalypse, and xxix, 44 (xii, 46) is a later gloss, as Juelicher[1] has recognized. Among the five passages found in Matth. and Mark, Matth. xvii, 9 (ix, 8) refers to the vision of the shining heavenly body of Jesus, evidently an anticipation of some vision confirming the belief in his resurrection. The Elijah question originally seems to have had no connection with the transfiguration. The text in Mark ix, 11-13 is late and confused; that in Matth. xvii, 10-13 may go back to an Aramaic original, "Thus must a man *(bar nash)* suffer by them," referring to John the Baptist. Matth. xx, 28 (x, 45) is probably a comment by the evangelist on the exemplification in the life and death of Jesus of the principle laid down by him.[2] Luke xxii, 27-30 contains a curious misunderstanding of the thought Jesus wished to convey. Matth. xxvi, 24b (xiv, 21b) occurs in an interpolation that breaks the connection, and is probably without historic foundation. The phrase occurs in Matth. xxvi, 45 (xiv, 41), but the connection is far better in Luke where it does not appear. In the single passage found only in Mark and Luke (viii, 31 and ix, 22) Jesus announces his death and resurrection on the third day immediately after Peter's confession. Of this Matthew knew nothing. He refers to the sufferings of the son of man for the first time

[1] *Gleichnisreden Jesu,* 1899, II, 142 ff.

[2] The suggestion that this too might go back to a genuine saying to the effect that "man (*bar nasha*) does not come (into the world) to be served, but to serve," should probably be withdrawn.

in xvii, 12 (Mk ix, 12), where the allusion seems to have been to John the Baptist, as stated above.

Among the eight passages found in all the Synoptics Matth. ix, 6 (ii, 10, v, 24) and xii, 8 (ii, 28, vi, 5) probably go back to original utterances. Matth. xvi, 27 (viii, 38, ix, 26) is a late addition, still further transformed by the other evangelists. As for the predictions of his death and resurrection in Matth. xvii, 22 (ix, 31, ix, 44) and xx, 18 (x, 33, xviii, 31), the latter furnishes the most natural situation. The difficulty of suppressing the political hopes of his followers, and the opposition he was sure to encounter in Jerusalem may well have filled his mind with evil forebodings. But he believed in a resurrection from the dead for those that should be accounted worthy of this privilege. It is therefore possible that he encouraged his disciples and himself with some such a remark as that "man must pass away, but he may rise again," or "a man may be delivered into the hands of men and be put to death, yet he may rise again." Matth. xxvii, 30b (xiii, 26, xxi, 27) belongs to the Synoptic Apocalypse or The Wisdom of God. In this work it is altogether probable that "a man" was first introduced and that subsequently there were references to "the man" in the same manner as in Enoch xxxvii-lxxi and Fourth Ezra. In Matth. xxvi, 64 Jesus answers the question whether he is the Messiah, "Thou sayest it," in Luke xxii, 69 "Ye say that I am." The meaning is unmistakably, "Ye say that I am the Messiah, but I have made no such statement." These evangelists are not willing to put upon the lips of Jesus an affirmative answer even under oath. Nothing could more clearly show how deeply they were under the influence of the theory that Jesus maintained to the end his incognito, refusing to make known his Messianic secret. Mark xiv, 62 departs widely from this earlier tradition by making Jesus admit his Messiahship. A critical study of the narrative renders it exceedingly difficult to believe in the historical character of the account of the trial before the Sanhedrin. Matth. xxvi, 24a (xiv, 21a, xxii, 22) belongs to an interpolation already mentioned.

When these passages are closely examined, some facts become very apparent. The evidence that Jesus used the term, or an equivalent, on this or that occasion is far from being positive and abundant. In most instances it is exceedingly precarious. When one evangelist affirms that he employed it, and the others affirm that he said "the kingdom of God," or "the kingdom of heaven" or "I," all cannot be right, and the critic must decide on inner grounds which evangelist comes nearest to recording the actual fact, or whether any of them can be trusted. When it occurs, as is frequently the case, in additions made by a single evangelist to a common report, even scholars who strongly maintain its use by Jesus feel little confidence. Even when all the Synoptics repeatedly assign to Jesus a statement containing it, like the prediction of death and resurrection, the evidence can scarcely be regarded as abundant, seeing that the gospels themselves represent the disciples as absolutely unprepared for the resurrection, and the risen Jesus as rebuking them, not for failing to believe his own prediction, but for not understanding the prophecies of the Old Testament. If testimonies are to be weighed as well as counted—and in matters of such gravity it would be inexcusable not to weigh them,—it must be admitted that the great majority of the passages that put the phrase upon the lips of Jesus fall very lightly in the scales. Suspicion would attach to them all, were it not that sound historical criticism demands, as a matter of course, that any saying of Jesus reported in a Greek text be translated back into the Aramaic vernacular before a final verdict be given. It then happens that just the passages which critics who never thought of this necessity on independent grounds were most inclined to accept as genuine reveal a sense at once so natural and so strikingly original as to furnish what, in comparison with the "mere conjecture" of all speculations, however necessary, based only on the uncertain Greek renderings, may justly be regarded as "positive and abundant evidence." It is also of interest for the Synoptic problem to observe that among the passages occurring in more than one gospel there are some in

Matthew and Luke, not found in Mark, that may go back to original sayings of Jesus: that the only passage found in Mark and Luke, but not in Matthew, cannot be regarded as genuine; that there is no authentic saying preserved in Luke, that is not also found in Matthew; that there are passages in Mark, as well as in Matthew and Luke, that are clearly of very late origin; and that there are passages in Mark, as well as in Matthew and Luke, in which the phrase may go back to an original *bar nasha* even after the episode at Caesarea Philippi[1]

There is a false impression in many circles as to the difficulty of finding the phrase in the Galilean dialect of the Aramaic which is likely to have been used by Jesus in those genuine utterances where the Greek translation, "the Son of Man," occurs. It is true that the literary material of this dialect apparently does not carry us further back than to the second century A. D. But the translation in this case is simplified by the fact that the Greek term can only be the rendering of a form compounded with *bar*, "son," and by the circumstance that of terms that may be considered *bereh de-'nasha, bereh de-gabra,* and *bereh de-bar 'nasha* must be eliminated. All of these are manifestly Christian renderings of the Greek term. *Bereh de-'nasha* has no natural meaning in Aramaic. An individual of the human species is called *bar 'nasha,* literally "son of men," "member of the human race." As the appended article gradually tends to lose its force, an anticipatory pronominal suffix is attached to the first noun, if the emphasis is to fall, lightly or heavily, on the second. Thus *bereh de-gabra* would mean, "son of him, viz., of the man," son of the particular man referred to before. *Bereh de-'nasha* would mean "son of it, viz., of the human race" or "son of the well-known human being." As a matter of fact, it never occurs except as a rendering of the Greek title, or what is supposed by Chris-

[1] The manifest tendency of these facts is to strengthen the observation made long ago by Hilgenfeld that in spite of its numerous and extensive later additions the first gospel is likely to be the earliest of our Synoptics. See further Ch. ix.

tian writers to be its equivalent. It is not a natural product of the language, but an artificial creation. It seems to have gradually crowded out the earlier *bereh de-gabra,* found in a number of passages in the Sinaitic and Curetonian,[1] and won final recognition in the fifth century in the Syriac Vulgate. Its absence in the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* probably shows that it never prevailed among the Christians in Palestine. The objection to the earlier translation *bereh de-gabra* (literally "son of him viz., of the man") was probably that "the man," "the masculine human being" seemed to point to Joseph. *Bereh de-bar 'nasha* (literally "the son of him, *i. e.,* of the son of man" or "the son of the individual of the human species") only shows how completely identical "man" and "son of man" were in some connections, and how in some sayings *gabra* was avoided. The only available term is *bar 'nasha.* From the second century A. D. on it was used more freely in Galilean works than in the Judaean Targums, though Dan. vii, 13 best shows how well established its usage was even in this dialect. That the generic use of *bar 'nasha* was unknown in Galilee only three generations before its first appearance in extant literature, is absolutely contrary to all probability. In translating long sentences back into the original there is always considerable risk. Where the question is only of a word, and there is practically no choice as here, the margin of error is exceedingly small.

Fiebig[2] has carefully examined both Talmuds, and much material besides, with the result that the philological conclusions on which the theory rests have been thoroughly corroborated. The work is of value, as some scholars had imagined that a radically different usage might be found in the parts of the Talmuds not yet examined for this purpose. Fiebig's conclusions will perhaps have all the more weight with cautious students, as he still clings to the idea that Jesus used the phrase as a mystifying title, and therefore

[1] *Luke* vii, 34 (Sin., Cur.); *Mark,* viii, 38 (Sin. [Ev.]); *Luke* ix, 26 (Cur.); *Luke,* xxii, 48 (Cur.); *John,* xiii, 31 (Sin. [Ev.]).

[2] *Der Menschensohn, Jesu Selbstbezeichnung,* 1901.

cannot be suspected of an undue bias. He acknowledges the essential accuracy of the observations made by the present writer on the question of the meaning of *bar nasha*, though he thinks that the treatment was too brief to allow a real insight into the facts.[1] That depends upon the eyes. To persons thoroughly familiar with Aramaic speech it was more than enough. Whether others will be convinced even by Fiebig's lexical studies of the Talmud, or my own contributions to the concordance of the Syriac Versions,[2] when the consequences are in full view, the future will show. Fiebig himself seeks in vain to avoid these consequences by the assumption that the phrase was used by Jesus in an ambiguous manner so that the hearers might believe that he was speaking of man in general or of "the man" *i. e.*, the Messiah as a third person, though in reality he was speaking of himself. Jesus must then have been willing to have his hearers infer that he cherished such bold and original ideas at that man for whose sake the sabbath was made was also lord of the sabbath, and that any man, not merely a priest, had the right to proclaim the pardon of sin. Yet it is supposed that in his heart he cherished the narrower and less logical conception that he alone, as the Messiah, was lord of the sabbath, and had the right to pardon sin. If he was capable of the former, why ascribe to him the latter? There is more than ambiguity of speech in this; there is duplicity of character. Is there any good reason why his character should thus be sacrificed for the sake of preserving his claim to Messiahship? And is there the slightest ground for supposing that "the Man" was understood even in esoteric circles as the Messiah? Designations like "the Chosen One," "the Just One," "the Restorer," "the Bridegroom," "the Lamb," suggest character or function, and are therefore intelligible;[3] "the Man on the Clouds" would

[1] *l. c.*, p. 59.

[2] In the article *Son of Man* in *Encyclopaedia Biblica.*

[3] This fact is not fully appreciated by Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums*, 1903, p. 254. But it is characteristic of the present situation that he does not dare to affirm that Jesus used the term Son

point to Daniel vii, 13, and names signifying this, like *'anani* or *bar nefele,* were formed. But it is not probable that either in Babylonian mythology or in Jewish apocalyptic speculation an important personage was referred to simply as "the man," "the human being."

Driver[1] suggests as a possibility that Jesus employed the term *bereh de-'nasha,* since *bar 'nasha* is likely to have been commonly used in the sense of man in general. But he labors under a wrong impression in regard to the use of this title. He thinks that it is always used in the Sinaitic and Curetonian Syriac. As a matter of fact, even in their present fragmentary condition, both of these texts exhibit the rendering *bereh de-gabra* in several passages.[2] It is also of importance that *bereh de-'nasha* is never used in the so-called Jerusalem Lectionary, which is the only Aramaic version of the New Testament likely to have been made in Palestine. What phrase the lost Gospel of the Hebrews contained cannot be determined by Jerome's Latin quotation, the text of which is itself uncertain, and the character of the book he had before him is very problematic. The distinguished Hebraist finally gives a qualified approval to Sanday's theory, that Jesus, who ordinarily spoke Aramaic, may have introduced the mystic title upon some occasions when he addressed his Galilean disciples in—Greek. It is not clear whether Driver would credit Jesus with having originated the remarkable Greek phrase. Until some new facts, or arguments not long ago considered and disposed of, shall be presented, to prove that Jesus regularly or occasionally addressed the fishermen of Galilee in Greek, it is to be hoped that earnest students will not be diverted from the path where duty lies, and great rewards for labor are in

of Man. He admits freely that "Jesus did not use the title as a constantly repeated self-designation." and only cautiously ventures to state that "it is not altogether impossible that Jesus may have some time used it."

[1] Article "*Son of Man,*" in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary.*

[2] See p. 128.

sight, by the spell of influential names.[1] Our manifest duty is to turn every purported saying of Jesus into Galilean Aramaic that we may test in his own vernacular the translations we may be fortunate enough to possess. Our precious reward consists in coming nearer to the spirit of Jesus, and of obtaining more abundant evidence of his transcendent personality. Menzies (*Hibbert Journal*, Oct., 1903, p. 187) objects: "If Jesus made no Messianic claim and was a teacher of humanitarian doctrine, conscious of no special religious position, how is the opposition of his fellow-countrymen, and how is the crucifixion to be accounted for?" Unless it can be proved that Jesus could have used *bar nasha* as a Messianic title referring to himself, there is no evidence that he claimed to be the Messiah. He certainly was a teacher of righteousness and love. He classed himself with the prophets and consequently must have been conscious of a special religious position. Jerusalem had killed her prophets before his time. His opposition to the leading parties, his peculiar ethical teaching and his life explain the opposition of his enemies. His crucifixion is accounted for by the false testimony borne against him and the political interests of Pontius Pilate

The following conclusions would then seem justifiable. In a number of pregnant utterances Jesus expressed his

[1] If new evidence on this point should be furnished by the eminent Oxford divines, it would of course become the duty of scholars seriously to consider it. If they have really discovered fresh proofs, or hitherto unnoticed considerations, tending to show that Jesus now and then delivered Greek addresses to his Aramaic speaking countrymen, a statement of these facts in connection with the conjecture would have been very welcome. If, furthermore, these discoveries, which Sanday and Driver owe it to themselves to communicate to the world, should actually prove that the sayings above considered as genuine were first uttered in these Greek speeches of Jesus, the view to which the present writer has been forced by all facts known to him would have to be abandoned or greatly modified. But the manner in which an universally discredited theory has been suddenly revived, without the slightest suggestion of the new grounds that entitle it to reconsideration, justifies the suspicion that nothing has been found that is likely to affect in the least the critical study of the gospels.

convictions concerning man's rights, privileges, conditions and destiny. These were preserved in faithful memory by the disciples who had heard them, and hoped that God would bring back to them on the clouds of heaven his holy servant, their beloved teacher. In course of time they were probably also committed to writing in the Aramaic language. The destruction of Jerusalem naturally gave a strong impetus to Messianic hopes, both among those who expected the return of Jesus as the Messiah, and among those who looked for a genuine son of David. Old prophecies were scanned; new prophecies were written. The passage in Daniel where the kingdom was promised to the saints also spoke of a celestial being who would receive it. Much thought was given to this heavenly personality. His identity was not clearly disclosed. He might be Michael, or Enoch; he might also be the true descendant of David caught up to heaven to be in readiness for the appointed time, or the translated prophet of Nazareth. In Fourth Ezra, Enoch xxxvii-lxxi, and the original form of the Synoptic Apocalypse, a man is introduced who is clearly none else than the celestial being in Dan. vii, 13, and is generally identified with the Messiah, though sometimes understood to be Enoch, and probably at times Michael. He does not figure yet in the Book of Revelation. But disciples of Jesus were aware that he had foretold the destruction of state and cult, although not in the form familiar to us with its apocalyptic accretions to his prophetic warnings. The time came when an apocalyptic work, predicting what had come upon Jerusalem for the murder of her prophets and righteous men, like Zechariah ben Barachiah, during the siege of the city, and foretelling the coming on the clouds of heaven of the man seen in Daniel's vision, was ascribed to Jesus himself. It is possible that it was translated into Greek under the title, "The Wisdom of God." The references in this apocalypse to a man coming on the clouds would naturally be understood as predictions by Jesus himself of his second advent. Meanwhile Hellenistic Jews who had been attracted by the gospel were influenced in increasing measure by Gnostic speculation.

This was itself the result of a fusion of Indian thought and Greek philosophy. Among the Indian ideas that seem to have entered into this composite faith, there was the conception of the Naravana, "the one like a man," "the son of man," a term designating the Purusha, or macrocosmic man. A distinction is made in the Rig Veda[1] between the Purusha as the absolute being, and Purusha as the first born. To the latter the name "son of man" was given.[2] A reflection of this idea is found in the "man" and the "son of man" in the system of the Christian Gnostics, who, according to Irenaeus, called the primeval light, the father of all things, *primus homo,* "the first man," and the first thought emanating from him *secundus homo,* "the second man," or *filius hominis,* "the son of man." It is probable that this speculation merged with the idea of the "son of man" in Daniel. When at the end of the first century our first two gospels were written in Greek, these ideas were floating in the air. The little apocalypse was incorporated in part in the two gospels, as later in the third, and the significance of the Greek term used in this document as a rendering of *bar 'nasha* ("the man") referring back to an initial *bar 'nash* ("a man"), naturally attached itself to passages elsewhere containing the same term as a translation of the generic *bar 'nasha.* Some old sayings were thus revealed in a new and more congenial light. It was not man, but the Christ who was the lord of the sabbath. It was not a human privilege, but a Messianic prerogative, to pardon sin. It was not man's common lot, but his own unnatural humiliation, that Jesus had described. It was not sins of man against man that Jesus had declared to be pardonable, but he had graciously proclaimed forgiveness even for sins against the Christ. It was not man's immediate resurrection from the dead that he had announced, but exclusively his own resurrection that he had foretold.

Thus the Aramaic expression, by which Jesus not only

[1] X, 90.

[2] Cf. Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums,* 1902, p. 348 ff.

cannot have conveyed any explicit or implied claims to the Messiahship, but actually seems to have given utterance to far more original and comprehensive views of life, became by a natural development a Messianic title. That it may have been understood in this latter sense by the writers of our gospels everywhere, is a correct observation of many scholars. Yet there were elements of truth in both the "emphatically high" conception of Herder and the "emphatically low" estimate of Baur. The Synoptists had their ideal as well as the Fourth Evangelist. What the Logos was to the latter, the Danielic "son of man" was to the former.[1] On the other hand, an underlying stratum of facts was divined by those who found here and there in the phrase an expression of the universal human sympathies of Jesus. It was also a correct feeling that led to the affirmation that to the end Jesus preached the kingdom of heaven, and not himself. But for a positive knowledge of the life of Jesus no line of investigation has been more fruitful than that which, based on sound philology, has demonstrated that Jesus cannot have called himself "the Son of Man."

[1] An examination of the meaning attached to the term "Son of Man" by the Fourth Evangelist is not essential for our present purpose, as it can throw no light upon its possible use by Jesus (See Ch. xi). But it may be noticed that Fries (*Det fjärde evangeliet,* 1898), who regards the gospel as originally written by the presbyter John and afterwards expanded by the Gnostic Cerinthus, attributes practically all the "Son of Man" passages to the latter; and that Kreyenbühl (*Das Evangelium der Wahrheit,* 1900), who considers Menander of Kapparetaea as its author, looks upon "Son of Man" in the gospel not as an exclusive self-designation of Jesus, but as a term applying to "man," "any man," *jeder Christenmensch.*" The Gnostic affinities of the gospel can scarcely be questioned, but Grill (*l. c.*) is right in tracing to Indian sources the conception of an incarnation of a divine being as "the Son of Man," and Jean Réville (*Le quatrième Evangile,* 1901) rightly emphasizes the paramount influence of Philo's thought.

CHAPTER VI

THE SON OF GOD

To generation after generation of Christian believers such expressions as "the Son of God," or "the Son," when found in the New Testament, naturally conveyed the same meaning as they had in the constantly repeated creeds. They were understood as designating the second person in the Holy Trinity, and more particularly his divine nature as distinguished from his human nature assumed in the incarnation. They were regarded as indicative of the fact that Jesus was not begotten of a human father, but conceived of the Holy Ghost. These names were freely given to Jesus in epistles considered to be of apostolic origin. According to the Gospel of John, they were frequently assumed by himself, and according to the Synoptics they were used by him as a self-designation on some important occasions. More than once God the Father proclaimed with an audible voice from heaven his divine sonship. And the demons themselves, when they tremblingly acknowledged his authority, addressed him as the "Son of God." The impression, therefore, was well-nigh unavoidable that to be the Christ was the same as to be the Son of God, and to be the Son of God was to be God the Son. Some men were no doubt called in Scripture "children of God," or "sons of God." But such a title, it was felt, must be taken as a figure of speech, applicable only in a secondary and derived sense. Even those who by faith were said to become the "adopted children of God," or "partakers of the divine nature" could not be thought of as real sons of God. While in his case the title implied deity, absolute identity of nature with the Father, in theirs it could only suggest a

new position as men redeemed from the power and penalty of sin and brought into living relations with the Son of God, a humanity transformed into moral likeness to God.

This conception of the Son of God could be maintained only where the ecumenic creeds were regarded as authoritative or the Bible, from force of habit and lack of proper methods of study, was interpreted in the light of these creeds. Wherever reverence for the Scriptures, sincere piety, and personal devotion to the Christ fostered independence of the Church and distrust of her creeds and institutions, there was a decided tendency to adopt anti-trinitarian views. Whether or not a historic connection can be traced between such religious societies as the Passagii, the Paulicians and the Patarenes[1] on the one hand, the Ebionites, the Marcionites, the Theodotians, the Noetians, the Paulianists and the Sabellians on the other, the direct resort to the New Testament with its different types of Christology naturally revived many an opinion condemned by the majority in the days of the upbuilding of dogma. The distinction made by men like Elipandus of Toledo, Felix of Urgel, and Claude of Turin between the eternal Son of God and Jesus as the adopted son of God tended to place the historic Jesus upon the same plane as other men who were also regarded as adopted sons of God. Among the Beghards, the Brethren of the Free Spirit, the Lollards, the Albigenses, the Waldenses, and the Brethren of the United Life there were many who questioned the view presented by the creeds.

But it was among the Baptists of the sixteenth century that freedom from dogma, a reverent and yet critical study of the Bible, personal loyalty to Jesus and a high conception of the worth of human nature, led to the complete rejection of the trinitarian idea of the term "Son

[1] There is no good reason for doubting the substantial accuracy of the story concerning Gerard of Asti told by Ludolph Senior, *Historia Mediolani*, II, 27, quoted by Césare Cantú, *Gli Eretici d' Italia* 1867, p. 129.

of God.'' This is the attitude of Hans Denck, Ludwig Haetzer,[1] Jakob Kautz, Michael Sattler and many of the Swiss churches, as well as of Tiziano, Francesco Negri, Celio Secundo Curione, Camillo Renato and the majority of the Italian churches in 1550.[2] While they maintained that Jesus was not God but a man born of Joseph and Mary,[3] a son of God only in the ethical sense in which this title may be applied to other men, and a saviour in so far as men may be morally helped by his example and spirit, other leaders of this radical party in the Reformation era still adhered to the doctrine that Jesus had no human father, and saw in his miraculous birth the justification of the title Son of God, but insisted that this natural son of God was a man, though the term ''god'' might also be applied to him, if taken in a generic sense. In this manner the term was explained by Martin Cellarius,[4] Michael Servetus, Rudolph Martini, Claude of Savoy, and apparently also by Lelio Sozzini,[5] Francesco della Segga, Giulio Gherlandi, Paolo Alziati, Antonio Rizzetto, Giorgio Biandrata, Matteo Gribaldo and Valentino

[1] It was only after his contact with Denck in Strasburg (summer 1526) that Haetzer began to deny the deity of Jesus, as Keim has shown, *Jahrbücher für Deutsche Theologie* I, 1856, p. 265 ff. Already Heberle recognized that Denck and Haetzer had not been together in Nürnberg before 1527, when Schlaffer visited them there, *Theologische Studien und Kritiken,* 1855, p. 871. This is of some importance, as it shows the source of Haetzer's radicalism, which, however, never touched the roots of thought laid bare by Denck's penetrating intellect, and lacked his balance of judgment and sweetness of temper.

[2] See *Archivo di Stato, Sant' Uffizio, busta* 9, found by Benrath (*Studien und Kritiken,* 1885, p. 20), published by Comba, *Revista Christiana,* 1885, described by Comba, *I nostri protestanti,* 1897, II, 488 ff.

[3] According to Manelfi's account, of which a copy is preserved in the State Archive at Venice (see the preceding note), Tiziano maintained that *Matth.,* i and ii, were later interpolations.

[4] The conception of Elohim (God) as a generic name and that of Jesus as a ''natural son,'' afterwards characteristic of Servetus's theology, were already expressed by Cellarius in 1527.

[5] See *Excursus B.*

Gentile,[1] while Melchior Hofmann and his numerous followers declared that Jesus as the Son of God did not derive his flesh from Mary, and David Joris seems to have used the term simply as a symbol of the Christian dispensation. In respect of Biblical exegesis not less than theological speculation the contributions of Denck and Servetus were unquestionably the most important. In his translation of the Prophets and his occasional explanatory glosses, Denck unmistakably shows that he discounts a considerable number of the supposed Messianic prophecies.[2] Of great significance is a pregnant passage in his treatise Concerning True Love. "Flesh and blood," he says, "would not understand God's love for men, were it not particularly manifested in some men whom people call divine men or children of God because they follow God as

[1] Men like Valdez and Vermigli have been wrongly classed as anti-Trinitarians. The attitude of Erasmus is difficult to interpret. He seems to have questioned the personality of the Holy Ghost and may have cherished more radical opinions than he cared to express.

[2] *Alle Propheten nach hebraischer sprach verteutscht,* Hagenau, 1528. I quote my own copy. In *Jer.,* xxxi, 22 b., Denck translates "das auss eym weib eyn man wirt," which means "that a woman becomes a man." To *Zech.,* iv, 1, he observes "die zwen sün des öls seind der hohe priester und der künig," the two sons of oil are the high priest and the king." *Zech.,* ix, 9, he translates "Siehe dein künig der kompt zu dir der ist der gerecht und eyn heyland, demütig und reitet auff eym esel, ja auff eym jungen füllin der eselin," "he rides on an ass, yea on the colt of a she-ass," observing the parallelism and avoiding the absurd "and" of other versions. To this passage he remarks that "the word *nosha,* Saviour, means in Hebrew one who receives help, that is who with his people persists through the power God gives and overcomes the enemy." *Zech.,* xii, 8, he renders "und das hauss David wie götter," "and the house of David as gods." It may be mentioned that in *Daniel,* vii, 25, and xii, 7, Denck translated "bis auff eyn zeit und zwei zeit und eyn halbe zeit." "until one time, two times and half a time," a rendering not found in the ancient versions nor in the modern translations until Houbigant, though "times" was correctly understood as "two times" by Münster, Vatblé, Piscator and Grotius. "Bis auff eynen gesalbten fürsten." "until an anointed prince," *Dan.,* ix, 25, should also be mentioned. It is to be regretted that Denck did not supply his text with more annotations.

their spiritual father. The more clearly this love is manifested, the more clearly it may be recognized by men; the more fully it is recognized, the more it is loved, the nearer is true blessedness. Therefore it has pleased the eternal love that the man in whom love should find its highest manifestation should be called a bestower of blessedness to his people: not that it were possible for a man to make anyone truly blessed, but that God would be so intimately united with him in love that all God's work would be this man's work, and all the suffering of this man might be regarded as God's suffering. This man is Jesus of Nazareth."[1] In this reverent yet boldly critical utterance Denck adopts the correct method by beginning with such generic terms as "Gotteskinder" and "goettliche Menschen," then seeking the real significance of these figures of speech, and finally estimating the greatness of the man Jesus of Nazareth without any resort to the technical terms of Biblical or ecclesiastical usage.

Servetus, on the other hand, endeavored to retain the terms "Son of God" and "God" as applied to Jesus by conceiving of him as the natural son of God through a superhuman birth, and by understanding God as a generic term. It is of importance, however, that in arguing the wider use of the Hebrew word Elohim (God) he quotes among other passages Gen. vi, 2, saying "and Peter calls those angels who in Gen. vi, are said to be Elohim or sons of Elohim."[2] Through

[1] *Von der waren Lieb,* 1527, p. 3 f. In his treatise, *Ob Gott ein Ursach des Bösen sei,* 1526, p. 9, quoted by Roerich, *Essai sur la vie de Denck,* 1853, p. 30, he declares that God is in all his creatures and continues, "if God is in me then all that belongs to God is in me." His idea of the divine manifestation is not limited to one man, and it is not confined to man. His thought is pantheistic.

[2] *De trinitatis erroribus,* 1531, p. 15. In the margin he remarks "the Aldine edition is not the Septuagint." As the Complutensian and the Lonicer edition of 1526 have the same reading as the Aldine and Servetus cannot have known either the Alexandrine MS. or the minuscules that give "angels" and not "sons of God," he seems to have based his assertion on the quotation in the Clementines and

Fausto Sozzini[1] a conception based on that of Servetus and less radical than the view presented by Denck and many of the early Baptists became prevalent in Poland, Transylvania and elsewhere. Giordono Bruno's[2] veiled criticism of the theanthropic conception was valuable in so far as it tended to direct attention to the general mythological presuppositions. This line of study was pursued more fully by Herbert of Cherbury.[3] John Toland[4] and William Whiston[5] by their studies of the early Ebionitish form of Christianity were led to the conviction that Jesus was born of Joseph and Mary. John Locke[6] rejected all other designations of Jesus than the Messiah. Some of the Pietists, notably Edelmann, sympathized with this restriction. The emphasis that Edelmann[7] put upon the rationality of the Christian religion led to a more careful examination of such terms as Son of God and Logos.

The first important monograph of the former title was written by D. F. Ilgen.[8] He quoted numerous examples from Greek and Roman writings to prove that in antiquity founders of states and kings in general were regarded as sons of gods. This he regarded as a figure of speech, and

Justin. Scholars who still quote the Sixtine edition as Septuagint should take a lesson in criticism from Servetus. Curiously enough he understands "a god of Israel" to be the name given to Cyrus in *Isaiah,* xlv, 3, and looks upon it in the light of the title "God" given to Moses in *Exodus,* vii, 1, a text that is now regarded as belonging to the priestly additions of the Persian period.

[1] Fausto Sozzini at first was not admitted into full fellowship in the Baptist churches of Poland because he would not be baptized. But subsequently they returned to the broader basis of fellowship proclaimed by Denck and welcomed him. In his attitude to Francis David he showed himself a less liberal attitude.

[2] *Spaccio della bestia trionfante,* ed. Wagner, II, 248; but compare also the sublime passage in *De Monade,* p. 151.

[3] *The Ancient Religion of the Gentiles,* 1705.

[4] *Nazarenus,* 1718.

[5] *Primitive Christianity Revived,* 1711-1712.

[6] *The Reasonableness of Christianity,* 1695.

[7] *Die Göttlichkeit der Vernunft,* 1740.

[8] *De notione tituli filii Dei,* in Paulus, *Memorabilien,* VII, 1795, pp. 119-198.

looked for its basis in the relation of the king as pupil to the divinity as teacher. Though Ilgen failed to reach the real source of the idea, his learned effort rendered a good service by preparing the way for a more correct appreciation. It called attention to the connection of the title with the kingship in Israel. Other kings than the Messiah had been called sons of God. The conviction spread that Son of God was a Messianic title, current among the Jews previous to the appearance of Jesus, and naturally applied to him as the Messiah. In the Tübingen school, the terms Son of God and Son of Man came to be regarded as antipodal, representing the exalted rank and the personal humility of the Messiah, but no longer his two natures, the divine and the human. The question was raised, how far Jesus had used these titles concerning himself. While the searching literary and historical criticism of Bruno Bauer led him to deny that Jesus had employed either as a designation of himself, Baur and his school clung to the idea that he had used the term Son of Man, but were inclined to question his use of the term Son of God. Schenkel registered the results reached by critical exegesis in the middle of the nineteenth century in an able monograph,[1] in which he showed that Jesus spoke of sons of God only in an ethical sense, but never referred to himself as the Son of God. This conclusion was possible only after the true character of the Fourth Gospel had been recognized and the later additions to the Synoptic Gospels had also been discerned. The subsequent study of the term has tended to confirm his view and to render it more unassailable. Philological arguments of considerable importance have added to its strength; and a more comprehensive investigation has revealed, with greater clearness, the origin and growth of the term.

In one respect the more disinterested exegesis of recent years has reacted against the attitude of both the rationalistic and the earlier historico-critical schools, and returned

[1] Article *Sohn Gottes* in *Bibellexikon*, 1875.

to a more original and at all times more popular point of view. It no longer hesitates to accept the essential identity of the conception "Son of God" and the conception "God" in many important Biblical passages, or at least is not disposed to deny that the beginnings of this popular identification are visible in the Scriptures. If to the ordinary Christian the term Son of God suggests a divine being, the term *bene Elohim,* or Sons of God, suggested to the early Hebrews "gods," "divine beings." In the Semitic languages the individual is often designated as the "son" of the species to which he belongs. Thus "a son of man" means "a man," and "a son of the gods" (*ben elohim, bar elahin*) means "a god." In Gen. vi, 3 ff., the *bene haelohim,* or "sons of the gods," who see that the daughters of men, *i. e.,* the women, are beautiful, and therefore go in to them and beget with them children who become famous giants, are members of the genus "god."[1] Hence the fear that through their aberration the human race may become immortal. The terms *elohim* and *bene elohim* were evidently once used indiscriminately. That the gods should have children and that these should partake of their own nature, is quite an obvious reflection. Where is the pantheon that does not have sons as well as fathers within the divine circle? When in Israel the term Elohim began to be used without a plural connotation and applied to the tribal deity, Yahwe, the term *bene Elohim* came to have the meaning of "angels." Thus it was understood in later times in Gen. vi, 3 ff. But even the angels were originally gods. As such they had once been identified with certain elements, or they had presided over the destinies of nations. These functions they continued to exercise as angels. They appeared in the fire, the lightning, the thunder cloud, the wind; they moved about in the stars; they were the guarding angels of the nations fighting their battles

[1] See Schmidt, article *Angel* in the *New International Encyclopaedia,* 1902.

on high.[1] They still remained within the celestial sphere, and were distinct from the sons of men and superior to them.

But the story in Gen. vi also shows that divine beings can have human offspring. The idea is found in many nations. Extraordinary personalities can only be accounted for as the offspring of gods and women, or goddesses and men. Human beings may therefore be the sons of gods by virtue of physical divine procreation. The tendency to make the eponym heroes sons of gods and women, seen in Greece and elsewhere, evidently existed also in ancient Israel. The primitive concrete conception has indeed for the most part been obscured by the later metaphorical use. But here and there the original divine paternity is only thinly disguised, as in the case of Isaac, and occasionally a phrase still preserves the marks of a period when it was not yet a figure of speech, as in Deut. xxxii, 8. When sometimes Israel is addressed as the son of Yahwe, sometimes the individual Israelites as his sons and daughters, the most natural explanation is that originally the eponymous hero was regarded as a son of Yahwe and the sonship of the members of the people as mediated through him.

In Israel, as in other nations, the king was looked upon as standing on a higher level than ordinary men. He was called the Son of Yahwe. He was the Anointed One. Originally the pouring out of oil on his head was a sacrifice, an act of worship. It was popularly thought that a divine spirit possessed him and that his wisdom was that of a divine being.[2] "My lord is wise," said the woman of Tekoa to David,[3] "according to the wisdom of the gods[4] to know all things that are in the earth." Even after the exile a descendant of the royal house who was expected

[1] See especially the *Book of Daniel*, where the angels of Persia, Greece and Israel figure prominently.

[2] I *Sam.*, x, 9; II *Sam.*, xiv, 20.

[3] II *Sam.*, xiv, 17, 20.

[4] The "angel" is an after-thought.

to sit upon the throne of David was called "a mighty god" (*el gibbor*).[1] When in the Hasmonaean age kings sat again upon the throne and regarded themselves as the sons of David, they derived comfort from the promise given by a prophet writing after the exile concerning the Davidic dynasty. This oracle[2] had spoken of Zion's king as the son of Yahwe. In a similar manner a Hasmonaean king is addressed in Ps. ii by Yahwe as his son, born as such on the day of his coronation, whom the nations and their rulers should obey. It is evident from Ps. xlv, 7, 8, that court-poets did not hesitate to address these monarchs as "gods." When their opponents scornfully designate them as "gods" and "sons of God," this shows both the prevailing custom and the Pharisaic objection to it. Both are explained by the court etiquette at Antioch and Alexandria. The Seleucidae received the title "Sons of God"; the Lagidae as successors of the Egyptian kings accepted such titles as "Son of Re," "Son of Helios," "Son of Isis and Osiris." It was natural for Hellenizing Jews to understand in the same manner such titles as "Son of Yahwe," "Son of Elyon," and to use as a synonym Elohim (*theos*). Later the terms *theos, divus* were used by the Roman emperors.[3] An inscription found at Priene and apparently written for the emperor's birthday praises Augustus as a son of God born to bring blessedness to mankind, as a Saviour of coming generations.[4]

In view of these facts it is rather astonishing that there is so little evidence of the use of the term Son of God as a title of the expected Messiah. Enoch cv, 2 is probably an interpolation.[5] Fourth Ezra vii, 28 ff., xii, 32, 37, 52,

[1] *Isaiah*, ix, 6. A son of Jehoiachin may have been meant.

[2] II *Sam.*, vii, 14.

[3] See E. Beurlier, *De divinis honoribus quos accepterunt Alexander et successores ejus*, 1890, p. 47, 59. Deissmann, *Bibelstudien*, I, 1897, p. 166 ff. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898, p. 224. *Elaha* was freely used in the East as a title of the emperors.

[4] *Mitteilungen des Kaiserlichen Archäologischen Instituts*, Bd. xxiii, p. 275 ff.

[5] In this judgment Drummond, Charles and Dalman concur.

xiv, 9, are all subject to grave doubts. The Aramaic original is lost, and the extant versions in Syriac, Latin, Ethiopic, Arabic and Armenian have all passed through Christian hands and suffered many changes especially in these passages. The uncertainty as to the original text in these places is greatly to be regretted, since in this work and the probably contemporaneous Parables of Enoch (in their earliest form) Jewish speculation concerning the Messiah unquestionably reaches its fullest development. When Celsus learned from Jewish informants that they looked forward to the coming of God's Messiah, but found in the Scriptures no prophecy of the coming of a son of God,[1] and when the Aramaic Targums to II Sam. vii, 14 and Ps. ii, 7, labor to avoid the literal meaning of son in these passages,[2] it is natural to suspect a reaction both against Christianity and against an earlier Jewish mode of thought. Was the term *bar Elaha* used at one time as a Messianic title? There is no direct evidence of this. But Dalman's objection on the ground of general avoidance of the divine name is not well founded. Matthew, who rendered most idiomatically the term "kingdom of heaven," used by Jesus in the sense of "kingdom of God," employs the terms "Son of God" and "sons of God" in such a manner as to suggest *bar Elaha* and *bene Elaha* in the original. If Aramaic speaking Jews ever spoke of the coming king of Israel as a Son of God, they certainly used the phrase *bar Elaha,* and not *bar elahin,* which meant "angel" or "god."

As a human being may become partaker of the divine nature by having a divine parent or as king by possession of a divine spirit, so he may become divine by elevation into the celestial sphere either in the midst of life through a translation, or at death, or on the last day, through a resurrection from the dead. Thus Gilgamish, Enoch and Elijah were translated, and a similar privilege was bestowed on some Greek heroes. When it is said in Luke xx, 36:

[1] Origen, *Contra Celsum,* i, 49.

[2] The Targum to II *Sam.,* vii, 14, renders "like a father" and "like a son," and to *Ps.,* ii, 7, "thou art dear to me as a son."

"They are the sons of God, being sons of the resurrection," this is clearly a conception familiar in Aramaic speaking circles. But even Hellenistic Jews who believed in the immortality of the soul without a resurrection held that the godly man was taken up to his abode among the sons of God to obtain his inheritance among the holy ones.[1]

There were, consequently, many lines of speculation that led to the use of this term, irrespective of the philosophical Logos-idea as elaborated by Philo. The term might have found an important place in the Christianized conception of the Messiah as the risen and translated Lord, particularly after the idea of a physical divine generation had developed, even if he had not been identified with the Philonic Logos. Yet without this addition to Christian thought the peculiar use of the term in the ecumenic creeds would not have been possible. Philo spoke of the Logos as "the perfect Son," "the first-born Son of God," "the second God," "God" (theos) without the definite article. This paved the way for the Fourth Gospel and the symbols of Nicaea and Constantinople.

The term "Son of God" occurs in the Synoptic gospels 27 times, and the term "the Son" 9 times. The former is found in Matthew 11 times, viz., iii, 17 (baptism), iv, 3, 6 (temptation), v, 9 (name of peace-makers), xiv, 33 (after walk on the sea), xvi, 16 (Peter's confession), xvii, 5 (transfiguration), xxvi, 63 (trial), xxvii, 40 (at the cross), 43 (alleged quotation), 54 (centurion). In Mark it occurs 7 times, viz., i, 1 (superscription), 11 (baptism), iii, 11 (demon), v, 7 (demon), ix, 7 (transfiguration), xiv, 61 (trial), xv, 39 (centurion). In Luke it occurs 9 times, viz., i, 32, 35 (annunciation), iii, 22 (baptism), 38 (genealogy), iv, 3, 9 (temptation), viii, 28 (demon), ix, 35 (transfiguration), xxii, 70 (trial). "The Son" alone is found in Matthew 5 times, viz., xi, 27 (three times in hymn to Father and Son), xxiv, 36 (not even the Son), xxviii, 19

[1] *Wisdom of Solomon*, V, 5.

(baptism); in Mark once, viz., xiii, 32 (not even the Son); and in Luke 3 times viz., x, 22 (all in hymn to Father and Son).

Already on text-critical grounds it may be shown that in a number of these passages the term is a late addition. This is the case with the phrase "not even the Son" in Matthew,[1] and probably also in Mark. It is also true of Matthew xxviii, 19, which originally neither referred to baptism nor to the three persons, as the quotations of the earlier text indicate.[2] In the only remaining utterance ascribed to Jesus in which "the Son" alone is used,[3] the uncertainty as to the text does not indeed affect the term; but the internal evidence is all the more decisive. In other instances it is likewise doubtful what the original text was, but the textual questions have less bearing on the subject. Where we possess a triple or a double version of the same saying, it is occasionally difficult to decide whether the term occurred in the earliest of them, as in the case of Peter's confession. It is a significant fact that the term Son of God is never put upon the lips of Jesus as a designation of himself or in reference to any one else, except in Matth. xxvii, 43, where his enemies taunt him on the cross with the assertion, utterly unfounded in the Synoptic representation, that he had claimed, "I am the Son of God." The title is ascribed to him by God and angels, by the devil and demons, by Peter, the high-priest (questioningly) and the centurion. "Son of God" in Mark i, 1, is not well supported and seems to be an addition; in Luke iii, 38, it is Adam who

[1] In *Matth.*, xxiv, 36. It is lacking in many Greek MSS., in the Syriac, Egyptian and old Latin versions, and found only in another group of Greek MSS., and the Armenian and Ethiopic versions and the Jerusalem Lectionary. On this and *Mark*, xiii, 32, see Merx, *Das Evangelium Matthaeus*, 1902, p. 356 ff.

[2] Eusebius frequently quoted the passage before the Council at Nicaea in this form: "Go ye forth and teach the nations in my name." It is unfortunate that our most important version, the Sinaitic-Syriac, ends in the midst of xxvii, 7.

[3] *Matth.*, xi, 25 ff.

is declared to be a son of God; and in Matth. xvi, 16, the definition of the Messiah as the Son of the living God is no doubt an after-thought. There is no clear instance, therefore, of the title being given him by the evangelists.

According to the earliest form of the story of the infancy in Luke, Mary was the wife of Joseph and Jesus their son. This story was afterwards retouched by a believer in the virgin birth. In i, 32 ff., the angel Gabriel announced to Mary that the child she was to bear would be called "the Son of the Most High," because the Holy Ghost would come upon her. Thus divine sonship was made dependent upon physical generation. The introduction of this mythical conception belongs to a secondary stratum[1] and probably has a Gentile-Christian origin.[2] The idea that the Son of God was born as such at the baptism is somewhat older. Luke iii, 22, seems to have read originally, "Thou art my son, this day I have begotten thee." This rests upon the conception of the king becoming a partaker of the divine nature at his accession to the throne. The appearance of Jesus in a celestial body[3] is probably a somewhat later idea, not untouched by incipient docetic speculation. There is no need to dwell upon the unhistorical character of these proclamations by celestial voices.

The Synoptic gospels represent Jesus as having been repeatedly proclaimed as the Son of God by demons who knew his real character,[4] and describe how Satan himself took advantage of his knowledge to tempt him.[5] There is no tendency at the present time to accept this view of the supernatural knowledge and activity of the demons. But some critics are inclined to the belief that

[1] See Conybeare, in *Zeitschrift für die Neu Testamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1902, p. 192 ff.

[2] Cf. Hillmann, in *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1891, p. 231 ff.

[3] *Matth.*, xvii, 1 ff.

[4] *Mark*, iii, 11; v, 7 (*Luke*, viii, 28).

[5] *Matth.*, iv, 1 ff.

the persons supposed to be possessed by demons actually uttered the words ascribed to the latter. It is argued that the intense political excitement, the extraordinary impression of Jesus' personality, and the successful cures that he wrought, may have caused some of these unfortunates to see in him their promised deliverer. It is not hope, however, but fear that the demons express. The very first demon that Jesus cast out is said to have known him and been afraid of him. There is no suggestion of a political character in their words. No unmistakable Messianic title, such as "Messiah," "Son of David" or "King of Israel" is ever put upon the lips of the possessed. Others are said to have hailed him as Son of David, but no demon apparently ever did. Besides, Matthew knows nothing about these utterances of demons or demoniacs. It is peculiar to Mark, though one passage has been taken over into Luke,[1] and seems to be connected with his view of the secret of Jesus' Messiahship, as Wrede[2] has shown. His Messiahship may have been concealed from men, but could not be hidden from the spirit-world, whether good or bad. The demons must have known, in spite of his disguise, the strong Son of God by whom they were to be judged. From the standpoint of the beliefs then current this is perfectly intelligible. The rejection of these alleged utterances of the demons does not, of course, imply a denial that Jesus practised exorcism.

At Caesarea Philippi, Peter probably declared, "Thou art the Messiah," or "Thou art the Lord's Messiah."[3] "The Son of the living God," not found in Mark and Luke, is probably a late addition. We have really no authentic information as to what took place at the trial of Jesus. Matthew and Luke assumed that he must have been asked whether he was the Messiah, and that he must have preserved his Messianic incognito to the end, refus-

[1] VIII, 28.

[2] *Das Messiasgeheimniss*, 1901, p. 73 ff.

[3] *Meshicha de Yahwe or Meshicha d' Adonai.* Cf. Targum to I *Sam.*, xxiv, 7, and the *Psalter of Solomon*, xviii, 7.

ing to answer the high-priest's question.[1] Mark, on the contrary, assumed that he admitted his Messiahship, when the Messiah was defined as "the Son of the Blessed." It is evident that when these accounts were written the terms "Son of Man," "Christ," "Son of God," and "Son of the Blessed" were all synonymous, or tending to become so, and that "Son of God" was equivalent to "God," so that the blasphemy of making oneself equal to God could be regarded as the charge brought against Jesus. Nothing could more clearly indicate the late and unreliable nature of this narrative.[2] According to Matthew and Mark, the centurion at the cross, moved by the miracles he had observed, exclaimed "Of a truth this is the Son of God."[3] The miracles recorded by Matthew were a great darkness, an earthquake, the rending of the veil in the temple, and the rising of the dead from their tombs. If such miracles actually occurred, it would still be difficult to understand how a Roman soldier could have drawn the conclusion that the Jew who had been put to death was the Son of God. But there is no reason to believe that any of these things happened. Mark is singularly unfortunate in his narrative owing to his habit of abbreviating the accounts he copied. He mentions only the rending of the veil in the temple, which the centurion could not see, and leaves his exclamation without any cause. The possibility remains that the centurion may have seen in the unusually speedy release from suffering an evidence that the prophet whom the Jews had crucified was a righteous man.[4]

If a cautious criticism of the records renders it certain that we have no evidence for supposing Jesus to have

[1] That is the force of the words "Thou sayest." Already the Greek phrase convinced Thayer (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, XIII, pp. 40-49) of this. Concerning the Semitic phrase there can be no doubt. See Merx, *Das Evangelium Matthaeus*, 1902, p. 384.

[2] See also Brandt, *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893, p. 53 ff., and Wellhausen, *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, 1899, VI, p. 207.

[3] *Matth.*, xxvii, 54; *Mark*, xv, 39.

[4] *Luke*, xxiii, 47.

been addressed by any one as the Son of God, or this title to have been used by himself, a strong presumption is raised against the genuineness of the utterance ascribed to him in Matth. xi, 25 ff. (Luke x, 21 ff.). Before this passage read as it does in our present MSS. with some variations between Matthew and Luke, it seems to have read in the Greek "and no one knew the Father except the Son, and no one the Son except the Father and he to whom the Son is willing to make a revelation."[1] This has been supposed to refer to the initial discovery by Jesus, at a given time in the past, of the fatherhood of God and of his own peculiar sonship. But no other passage in the Synoptic gospels indicates that Jesus made the discovery that God is a father, or conceived of his fatherhood in such a manner as to lead him to the conclusion that he alone stood in the relation to God of a true son. Ewald[2] long ago pointed out that the difference of the aorist from the present tense in the Greek would not appear in the Hebrew *yada'*, and Dalman[3] rightly maintains that in the Aramaic text the participle *yada'* and the perfect *yeda'* could not be distinguished. If *nekar* was used in the causative, perfect and participle would indeed be distinguishable, but the perfect would not necessarily convey the sense of action in the past, particularly in the case of a verb of this character. Klöpper[4] with much force urges the improbability of the revelation of the son through the son. "No one knows the Son except the Father" is a somewhat irrelevant statement that has the appearance of a gloss drifting into different places. A more original form of the text seems to have been, "All things (that are hidden from the wise and revealed to babes) have been transmitted to me by

[1] For a fuller statement of the textual conditions, see the article *Son of God* by the present writer in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, vol. IV.

[2] *Jahrbücher für Biblische Wissenschaft*, 1855, p. 160.

[3] *Die Worte Jesu*, 1898, p. 233.

[4] *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1896, p. 501 ff.

the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son, and he to whom the Son is willing to reveal (the Father)." But even such an utterance is out of harmony with the admittedly genuine sayings of Jesus, and casts an undeserved reflection upon his character. His real teaching concerning God as a father and man as his child is as far removed from such speculations on the metaphysical relations of "the Father" and "the Son" as his humble and well-balanced character is from such assumptions of omniscience and Lordship. How can the gentle teacher who protested against men calling him "Good Master" on the ground that none is good save one, God only, be supposed to have imagined himself possessed of all knowledge and regarded all other men as ignorant of God? Language and thought alike show that the author of the passage was familiar with most, if not all, of the Christological development from Paul to the Fourth Gospel. Brandt[1] considers it as a hymn constructed of material that has been to some extent borrowed from Ecclesiasticus li.

As to the story of the wicked husbandmen, Matth. xxi, 33-46, Jülicher[2] has in a most convincing manner demonstrated its allegorical rather than parabolic nature and the impossibility of regarding it in its present form as an utterance of Jesus. It differs from all genuine parables in its lack of verisimilitude, its many assumptions contrary to fact, and the confusion of the narrative by reflections upon later historic situations and doctrinal developments. When Matth. xxii, 1-14 is compared with Luke xiv, 15-24, it is readily seen that the latter is more original. The former has been elaborated in several respects. Among these is the introduction of the figure of the king's son. The motive of the transformation is quite obvious.

The present Greek text of Matthew gives the impression that Jesus made a distinction between his God and the God of the disciples, his Father and theirs. This impression is

[1] *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893, pp. 561, 576.

[2] *Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 1899, p. 385 ff.

created by the use of the possessive pronoun. He says "my Father" and "your Father," but "our Father" only in a prayer designated for his disciples in which it may be supposed that he did not join. How far the author of our Greek Matthew was himself conscious of such a distinction, is difficult to decide. In the case of the Lord's Prayer[1] it may be questioned whether he had any thought of an objection on the part of Jesus to identifying himself with his disciples by the use of the pronoun. The pronoun of the second person plural has scarcely any such emphasis in itself as it obtains by contrast with the pronoun of the first person singular occasionally employed. Whether the Greek writer thought of this is again subject to doubt. But the fact that the Synoptic parallels often fail to give this personal pronoun raises the question whether in its original form even the Greek Matthew had it. Thus the whole discussion about the significance of "our" in the Lord's Prayer becomes futile by the observation that Luke begins the prayer simply with "Father," without any pronoun. Of more fundamental importance, however, is the fact that in the original Aramaic it is exceedingly probable that no pronoun was used in any of the cases in question. This is not only a conclusion from general custom. Where the Greek Matthew has "my Father," the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum* has simply *Abba,* "Father" in all extant passages (x, 32, 33, xvi, 17, xviii, 10, 19, 35, xxvi, 39). The same is true also in Luke (ii, 49, x, 22 al.). If this Aramaic version was made from the Greek without the aid of an earlier Aramaic translation, the absence of the possessive pronoun either indicates that it did not exist in the copy of the Greek text used, or a very strongly entrenched usage in the Aramaic. If, as seems probable, an earlier Aramaic gospel was consulted in the preparation of this version, possibly the first gospel used by Aramaic speaking Christians, the testimony is of utmost importance. Different lines of evi-

[1] *Matth.,* vi, 9 ff.; *Luke,* xi, 2 ff.

dence lead to the conclusion that Jesus said neither "my Father" nor "your Father," but "the Father who is in heaven" (*Abba di bashemayya*).

In a series of reported sayings, the genuineness of which there is no reason to question, Jesus used the term "sons of God," or an equivalent, in such a way as to imply moral likeness to God. A figurative use of the expressions "father" and "son" in religious parlance, no longer involving the thought of physical generation or descent, may be traced back to the great prophets of the eighth century. In Isa. i, 2, xxx, 1, the Israelites are called "sons of Yahwe." Later Deuteronomy declares, "Ye are the sons of Yahwe your God,"[1] and asks, "Is he not thy Father, thy maker?"[2] Yet the words "As a man chastens his son, so Yahwe,"[3] show that the language is felt to be figurative. In Jeremiah, Yahwe is said to be a father,[4] and asks, "How shall I place thee among sons, *i. e.*, make thee a son?"[5] In Jer. xxxi, 9, Yahwe promises, "I shall be a father to Israel, and Ephraim shall be my first-born." The same thought is expressed in Exodus iv, 22. In a post-exilic addition to Hosea the prospect is held out to the Israelites that they shall be called "sons of the living God."[6] In Isa. lxiv, 8, the people speak of God as "our father." In Ps. lxxiii, 15, the Jews are spoken of as "the generation of thy children." The fatherhood of God is finely expressed in the prayer found in Ecclesiasticus xxiii, 1 ff. In Ecclus. iv, 11, the Hebrew reads, "and God shall call thee son," an expression reminding strongly of the manner in which Jesus referred to sonship. The same ethical character is given to the term in the Wisdom of Solomon, ii, 18, "If the righteous man is God's son, he will uphold him." A num-

[1] XIV, 1.
[2] XXXII, 6.
[3] I, 31; viii, 5.
[4] III, 4.
[5] III, 19.
[6] II, 1 (Eng. tr., i, 10).

ber of passages in this book describe the Israelites as sons and daughters of God, and in xviii, 13, Israel is said to be recognized by the Egyptians as "God's son." In Judith ix, 4, the Jews are God's "dear children"; in Esther vi, 14, they are "the sons of the only true God"; in III Macc. vi, 28, they are "the sons of the most mighty and heavenly living God"; in *Oracula Sibyllina* III, 702, they are "sons of the great God"; in the Psalter of Solomon vii, 30, they are "sons of their God"; in the Assumption of Moses x, 27, they are "sons of God," and in IV Ezra vi, 58, they are spoken of as "thy people, first-born and only-begotten." The predominant idea no doubt was that the Israelites were sons and daughters of Yahwe by virtue of their connection with Yahwe's holy people, but even in this limitation the idea of moral likeness to their God is largely present. And occasionally the thought of a spiritual sonship based on character is expressed.

It is this ethical sense that Jesus seems to have given exclusively to the term. In Matth. v, 9, he voices his conviction that when the kingdom of heaven shall come, the peace-makers will be recognized as the sons of God, his spiritual kindred. In Matth. v, 45, those who show a forgiving spirit, and in this respect are like God, are spoken of as the sons of God. As there is some moral likeness to God in all men, all are in one sense his children, and he stands in the relation of Father even to those who are themselves evil.[1] In fact there is evil in all of God's children. It is not right to call any man good. Jesus deprecated this attribute in his own case, as he rejected such titles as "Rabbi," "Abba," "Moreh"; for "one is the master," "one is the father," "one is the teacher," "one is good," namely God.[2] But he knows that there is a higher realization of ethical likeness to God in some men than in others, and is not disposed to overlook the dis-

[1] *Matth.*, vii, 11.

[2] It has been most clearly recognized by Köhler (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, XIII, p. 567 ff.) that Rabba, Abba and Moreh all refer to God in the saying of Jesus recorded in *Matth.*, xxiii, 8 ff.

tinction. Even when he spoke of the angel-like existence of those who were raised from the dead and were sons of God, being sons of the resurrection,[1] he associated with the term an ethical quality. They were persons accounted worthy of a resurrection, and they lived a life of divine purity.

It is evident that Jesus derived inspiration, comfort and strength from the thought that he was himself a child of the Heavenly Father. His keen sense of the fatherhood of God created within him a true filial attitude and a feeling of brotherly affection for all God's children, the sons of men. In reverence and love he sought to enter into fellowship with God. How richly he was rewarded, he himself realized, not without a sense of exaltation, but in marvelous freedom from spiritual pride and selfish ambition. It is not for the historian, who can only tentatively and with many misgivings affirm that certain words may have been spoken by the great prophet of Nazareth, and that certain events are likely to have occurred in his life, to presume upon a description of the innermost thoughts that stirred his mind and the deepest emotions that filled his heart. Many things which occupied that pure and lofty spirit were carried forever beyond the ken of his fellow-men by the cross of Calvary. Yet none tell more freely their deepest secrets than the truly great. The vitality of their message and the power of their influence are largely due to this full and unreserved self-expression. There can be no doubt that the thoughts and principles which stand forth most vividly in his genuine utterances occupied the largest room in his inner world, that the love of God and man which his message breathes stamped his ideas and shaped his relations to all things in heaven and earth. If he conceived of the fatherhood of God and the sonship of man as universal, and avoided the temptation of assuming a special and unique relationship not attainable by others, it was because the genuineness

[1] *Luke*, xx, 36.

of his experience and the righteousness of his moral disposition gave him a peculiarly clear vision of truth. So well did he realize his ideal of man as the child of the Father in heaven that men, fascinated by the spiritual beauty radiating from him, have gladly accorded him a title (he never thought of claiming for himself, and have called him the Son of God.)

In proportion as the distance in time increased between him and those to whom his personality became the symbol and agency of man's redemption, the term Son of God assumed a more and more metaphysical significance. Especially was this true among Hellenistic Jews and converted Greeks and Romans. The tendency may be observed in the Pauline literature: the later epistles—such as those to the Colossians, Ephesians and Hebrews—show a more marked influence of Philo's thought. In the New Testament the climax is reached in the Johannine writings. The Fourth Gospel uses the term Son of God 10 times, viz., i, 34 (testimony of John), 50 (Nathanael's confession), iii, 18 (belief in him,), v, 25 (dead hearing his voice), vi, 69 (Peter's confession), x, 36 (use in the Old Testament), xi, 4 (glorification through Lazarus), xi, 37 (Martha's confession), xix, 7 (equal to God), xx, 31 (purpose of the gospel). "The only begotten Son" occurs twice, viz., i, 18, and iii, 16, and "thy Son" once, in xvii, 11. "The Son" is found 14 times, viz., iii, 17, 35, 36, v, 20, 21, 22 twice, 23, 26, vi, 40, viii, 35, 36, xiv, 13, xvii, 1. ("The Son of God" is used by John the Baptist, Nathanael, Peter, Martha, and the evangelist, but rarely by Jesus himself; "the Son" is as a rule employed by Jesus alone. In the churches whose Christological conceptions this gospel reflects the longer form was evidently used in public confessions of faith, and the shorter form had come into vogue in theological discussions. To the Fourth Evangelist "the Son" was a divine being who had appeared in the flesh, a god who had assumed human nature. It was not blasphemy for him to claim a title felt to be equivalent to "God," for he had been sent from heaven, since the

Scriptures called those "gods" who had only received oracles from heaven.[1] In this gospel those are praised whose faith permits them to say "my Lord and my God," without having seen the evidences of Christ's resurrection.[2] While the character and date of the Fourth Gospel render it impossible to use it as a source for the life and teaching of Jesus,[3] it is one of the most precious testimonies left us by the Early Church, not only of an important type of Christian thought, but, what is more, of the spiritual freedom with which Jesus makes those free who are touched by his spirit.

It is the thoroughness with which Jesus realized in himself the ethical content of a filial attitude toward God that is the ultimate reason for the fact that divine sonship, both in a physical and a metaphysical sense, has been attributed to him. This is the secret of the quickening touch he has ever communicated to the life and the freedom of the spirit, and which affects the modern world no less powerfully than the ancient.

[1] X, 33 ff.
[2] XX, 29.
[3] See chapter ix.

CHAPTER VII

THE LOGOS

"In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and the Logos was God," "and the Logos became flesh and tabernacled among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory of an only begotten (son) of the Father, full of grace and truth." These words in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel[1] are the Scriptural basis of the doctrine of the incarnation. In the light of the ecumenic creeds they were naturally understood as affirming that the eternal Son of God, the only begotten of the Father, the second person of the Trinity, had become a man. The utterances ascribed to Jesus in the Gospel could not but appear as in perfect harmony with a divine personality revealing himself in the flesh. And the traditional authorship seemed to preclude any question as to the genuineness of these discourses. If such words were actually spoken by Jesus, there could be no doubt that he regarded himself as a being different in his nature from all other men, standing in absolutely unique relations to the Father, holding an eternal Sonship entirely out of the question in the case of a mere man and implying possession of the attributes of deity.

But there was a time when it had not yet entered into the mind of any disciple of Jesus to apply to him the term Logos, to speculate upon the relations of the Father and the Son, or to assume that God had appeared in the flesh. When the idea of an incarnation of the divine Logos in Jesus was presented in the Church, it met with

[1] *John*, i, 1, 14.

strong opposition on the part of conservative Christians,[1] who recognized its origin. They knew that the Logos-speculation had its source in Greek philosophy, and that the notion of a divine emanation appearing in the flesh was characteristic of Gnosticism. Hence they regarded the Fourth Gospel as a work of the Gnostic teacher, Cerinthus.[2] In the Reformation Period Baptist thinkers in Italy[3] revived this attitude toward the teaching of the Fourth Gospel, though without committing themselves to the conjecture as to its authorship made by the Alogi in Christian antiquity. Since the end of the eighteenth century careful examination by competent Christian scholars has rendered increasingly manifest the essential correctness of this view. The sporadic attempts to remove the Logos-idea of this gospel from its natural place in the history of philosophical thought in the Graeco-Roman world and to vindicate for it a different origin have signally failed. The more thoroughly this history is studied, the more evident it becomes that the thought of the Fourth Evangelist is only a link in a chain that extends from Heraclitus to Athanasius and in fact reaches beyond these points in both directions, and that the most important earlier links were furnished by Heraclitus, Plato, the Stoics and Philo of Alexandria.

The tendencies of thought that found expression in the Greek speculation concerning the Logos may be observed in the intellectual life of many other peoples. Man's great achievement in giving utterance to his thought, and making it intelligible by means of articulate speech, left a long-lived impression of the mystery and power of the word. Many races still preserve the conviction that by the spell of the word gods can be moved, demons can be bound, men can be ruled, the sick can be healed, miracles

[1] Epiphanius (LI, 4) distinctly says of the Alogi "they themselves seem to believe the same things as we," and neither Irenaeus nor Hippolytus ever suggests that they were heretics.

[2] Epiphanius, LI, 3; Philaster, *De haeres*, LX.

[3] See Comba, *I nostri protestanti*, 1897, II, 488 ff.

can be wrought. The rhythmical expression, the approved formula, the secret term of conjuration, is especially thought to possess great potency. As among men there are priests, prophets, diviners, exorcists, magicians whose word is more powerful than that of others, so there are, in the world of spirits, prophets, interpreters, speakers whose voice is especially heard and whose word is never void of effect. There are gods like Nabu, Hermes, Mercury, Loke. As the local gods form themselves into groups, families, organized monarchies, these become the spokesmen of the divine council or the supreme ruler. Nabu represents Marduk, Hermes speaks for Zeus, Loke executes the commands of Odin. One god brings the message, or carries out the will, of another. With the growth of philosophic reflection, the attributes of one god are given to another; one reveals himself through another; the universal concept of divinity becomes manifest in each; gods are identified. As a god may live in and manifest himself through another god, so he may dwell in a man and reveal his power and wisdom in him. There is the hidden and the revealed divinity. A maturer thought sees in man, whose word expresses his idea and will, a microcosm reflecting the character of the macrocosm, and postulates a universal reason expressing itself in the phenomenal world.

There is abundant testimony of such a development. Our growing acquaintance with the thought of India and Persia, of Babylonia and Egypt, furnishes evidence of both its lower and higher stages. How far the earlier or contemporaneous speculations of some of these nations supplied original impulses or new directions to the thought of Greek philosophers, is exceedingly difficult to determine. The Greeks had the happy faculty of putting the impress of their own genius so thoroughly upon anything they touched that even what they borrowed has all the appearance of being their peculiar property. It would be hazardous to affirm an influence from India before the Persian wars, and scarcely safe to insist upon

it before Alexander or even the establishment of the Graeco-Bactrian kingdom and the diplomatic relations between the kingdom of Pataliputra and Alexandria. But after the middle of the third century important currents of thought may have flowed to the West. Beyond a question Philo as well as the great Gnostic teachers were influenced by ideas whose home was in India and Persia. Concerning the elements of thought that may have reached the Ionian Greeks through Asia Minor from the Babylonian sphere of influence we are still in the dark.

On the other hand, it is a well-known fact that numerous Greeks were settled in Egypt in the seventh century and that many thoughtful men crossed the Mediterranean to behold the wonders of the ancient civilization in the valley of the Nile. We are better prepared to state what they might have learned of the wisdom of the Egyptians, had their acquaintance with language and literature been even equal to our own, than what they actually did learn. It is not improbable, however, that the Greeks settled in the land with whom distinguished visitors came in contact were to some extent familiar with Egyptian speech and letters and able to give them much curious information. We know that in the days of Psammetich priests in Memphis expressed ideas that are not far removed from the earlier forms of the Logos-conception;[1] and there is no reason to believe that these were held in such an esoteric manner that intelligent Greeks, athirst for knowledge and filled with admiration for Egyptian learning, may not have become acquainted with them. Be this as it may, the influence of native thought upon the Greek-speaking population of the Delta in Ptolemaic times has undoubtedly been underestimated. There were many native Egyptians who spoke Greek, and their relations with Macedonians, Greeks and Jews must have offered constant opportunities for interchange of thought.

When the development of the Logos-conception is

[1] See J. A. Breasted, in *Zeitschrift für Aegyptische Sprache und Altertumskunde*, xxxix, 1901, 1 ff.

treated as essentially a product of Greek thought, it must, therefore, be borne in mind that extraneous influences cannot be wholly excluded. In order to appreciate fully the significance of this idea, it is necessary to consider it in connection with the growth of Greek philosophy. This has recently been done by Anathon Aall[1] in a lucid and, for the most part, convincing manner. For our present purpose it must suffice to call attention briefly to the salient features of its long history. Already in the Orphic religion the divine immanence is emphasized. Zeus is in all.[2] Thales regarded God as the reason (*nous*) of the world.[3] Xenophanes preached the doctrine of the unity of God with the fervor of a Hebrew prophet; but his monotheism was not based on reverence and zeal for a tribal deity, it was founded on his conviction that the universe is governed by one reason.[4] Parmenides distinguished between the phenomenal world perceived through the senses and absolute being revealing itself to human reason. For this instrument of certain knowledge he used the term Logos.

It may not be capable of absolute proof, but is extremely probable, that Heraclitus of Ephesus who lived in the fifth century B. C. was influenced by Persian thought. The part played by fire in his system is particularly significant. In view of his polemical attitude to the popular cults it is doubtful whether this impact came through the mysteries. His personal relation to the Logos is suggestive of Oriental modes of thought. "Not to me," he declares, "but to the Logos ye should listen." Yet this

[1] *Der Logos*, I. *Geschichte der Logosidee in der griechischen Philosophie*, 1896, II. *Geschichte der Logosidee in der Christlichen Literatur*, 1899. The most important earlier monographs are those by J. M. Heinze, *Die Lehre vom Logos in der griechischen Philosophie*, 1872, and Jean Réville, *La doctrine du Logos dans le quatrième évangile et dans les oeuvres de Philon*, 1881. The studies of Gfrörer, Soulier, Seigfried and Grill have also furthered our knowledge.

[2] Stobaeus, *Eclogae*, I, 40.

[3] Stobaeus, *Eclogae*, I, 56.

[4] See Fragment 3 in Karsten, *Philos-Graec*, 1.

Logos is not a personality; it is the objective, universal reason whose spokesman he feels himself to be and whose claims to recognition he urges against the assumptions of individual reason. It may not be permissible to press his professed monism into logical consistency by postulating an identity of Logos and fire. Heraclitus makes an epoch in the history of the Logos-conception, because with him the term is used for the first time as a designation of cosmic, universal reason.[1]

Neither Anaxagoras nor Empedocles, neither Plato nor Aristotle continued directly the Logos-speculation of the Ephesian philosopher. But indirectly they all contributed to a marked extent to the further development of this idea. Anaxagoras gave to the term *Nous* a richer content, making it suggestive of spirit rather than abstract reason,[2] and Empedocles introduced into the spiritual substance of the world the two motive forces of love and hate.[3] This extension of the idea in the direction of personality left the apparently lifeless part of the universe out of consideration. A dualism resulted which the Socratic school sought to overcome by a teleologic idealism. We have not the means of determining precisely what contribution Socrates made to this new movement of thought. It may be assumed, however, with some degree of probability, that the view of objective reality as consisting of a system of cognizable conceptions ethically determined by the cosmic end, and of the subject as realizing its ideal and obtaining adequate knowledge through moral and intellectual self-perfecting, goes back to him. Plato conceived of the universe as a living being possessed of reason, will, goodness and beauty, becoming known to human reason in a system of ideas which constitute the

[1] See especially Anathon Aall in *Zeitschrift für Philosophie und philosophische Kritik*, 1895, p. 217 ff., E. Pfleiderer, *Die Philosophie des Hera klit von Ephesus im Lichte der Mysterienidee*, 1886, and Schuster in *Acta Societatis philol. Lips.*, 1873.

[2] Mullach, *Fragm. phil. graec., Anaxagoras* fr. 12.

[3] *l. c.*, 378 ff.

thought-forms and real substance of the phenomena perceived through the senses. Like Socrates, he believed in a *daimon*, sometimes conceived of as a shadow of the personality, its reflection in an idea, sometimes as an ideal *ego* imposing its higher demands on the actually realized *ego*. It is difficult to avoid the impression that this is a Hellenized form of the Egyptian idea of the shadow, double, or genius, called *ba* or *ka*. Aristotle was led by his profound study of nature to reject Plato's doctrine of fixed thought-forms, or ideas, as bringing in a series of intermediate entities unwarranted by the facts. But though he substituted for the system of ideas the conception of an organism with its functions, he was none the less an idealist. In this philosophy the word Logos is used only as a technical term for concept.

When the Stoic philosophers, Zeno, Cleanthes, Chrysippus, and their successors, returned to the conception of Heraclitus, they were able to draw upon the wealth of thought bequeathed by the Socratic school. Though, in their endeavor to establish a monistic view of the universe, they clung somewhat more closely to the conception of vital energy, and transformed the ideas of Plato into powers, thus exposing themselves to the ill-founded suspicion of materialism, they strongly affirmed the rationality and moral quality of cosmic life. The Logos-conception became an instrument for the expression of both their ontology and their ethics. New names were coined by them for the different aspects of the Logos. As the vital force of the universe it was called *Logos spermatikos*. As operative in human consciousness, it was viewed either in the light of an unexpressed faculty, *Logos endiathetos*, or as an outgoing manifestation, *Logos prophorikos*. But, however expressed, the Logos implied the rationality of the scheme of existence and the universality of moral law. The precise relation between the Logos and the God-idea of the Stoics cannot easily be defined. It would be going too far to assert that the Logos of these thinkers was a personal entity. But it is

equally uncertain whether they conceived of the living macrocosm so closely on the analogy of man as the microcosm as to give it the same kind of a personality. The reports of Christian opponents that have the most direct bearing on this point manifestly suffer from a want of adequate appreciation. There can be no question that the Logos-conception effectively helped to make Stoicism the greatest agency for the intellectual and moral uplift of the Graeco-Roman world.[1]

The influence of Philo[2] upon the further development of this idea is so marked that there is a decided tendency to overestimate his originality. He undoubtedly based his conception largely upon that of the Stoics. Such modifications as may be observed are apparently due either to the strong impression of Plato's thought or to the necessity of bringing the altogether heterogeneous ideas of his Jewish ancestors into harmony with Greek philosophy. The Stoics themselves furnished him with the instrument for achieving the latter task in the allegorical method of interpretation. It is not impossible that he was to some extent affected also by native Egyptian and Oriental speculation. But the traces of such an influence are more marked in parts of his system not so closely connected with the Logos-idea[3] From the appearance of the term *Memra* (Word) in Aramaic Targums it has been inferred that Philo may have received impulses from speculations current in the Palestinian synagogues. But the date of these Targums renders any such assumption unsafe. The oldest of them is not likely to have been edited before the third century A. D., and cannot be used with any degree of assurance to show what oral render-

[1] The account of the Stoic Logos idea and its influence on Stoic ethics given by Anathon Aall (*Geschichte der Logosidee*, I, 98-167) is both appreciative and critical.

[2] An admirable sketch of the life and writings of Philo will be found in Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, 3d ed., III, 1898, p. 487-562.

[3] For instance, in the doctrine of metempsychosis.

ings of Biblical passages were current in the synagogues of Palestine before the time of Philo. This was already seen by Bruno Bauer, and is now generally recognized.[1] Whether the Targumic tendency to ascribe to the *Memra* certain activities and feelings ascribed by the Biblical text to God is due to acquaintance with Philo, as many suppose, or is the product of a similar occupation with Greek philosophy on the part of Palestinian rabbis impelled by the general desire to transfer divine functions to intermediate beings, is a question that admits of no definite answer. It may be noted, however, that in the remains of Jewish Alexandrian writings from the period before Philo, the Logos plays no rôle, whereas the term Wisdom is used in a similar manner. This goes back to Palestinian custom. Already in the book of Proverbs "Wisdom" appears in a position that suggests personality. It probably has a Persian[2] rather than a Greek origin. While there is no indication that Philo to any extent drew his Logos-conception from this Sophia-conception, the prevalence of the latter both in Palestine and in Egypt before Philo renders it probable that the Jewish mind began to operate with the former idea about his time. If he was not the first to do so, he was, by virtue of his extraordinary capacity and prestige and the great extent of his writings, the foremost and exercised the widest influence.

Philo possessed a thorough and extensive familiarity with Greek philosophy. But he was a Jew. He believed in the truth of the divine oracles delivered to his fathers, and he was convinced that the wisdom of the Greeks was only a reflection of the wisdom of Moses. His trained mind perceived very clearly that much of what was ascribed to the Supreme Being in the Bible was both impossible and unworthy of him. But this was only so, when

[1] See especially Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria als Ausleger des Alten Testament an sich selbst und nach seinem geschichtlichen Einfluss betrachtet*, 1875.

[2] The prototype seems to have been the Spenta Aramati.

the words were understood in a literal sense. By the allegorical method he was able to see in them the same truths that were in different language expressed by the Greek thinkers. One of the greatest difficulties, even with this method, was the doctrine of creation. It was through the Logos of the Stoics and the ideas of Plato that he escaped from this difficulty. The *Logos spermatikos,* the second god, the manifestation of the invisible and unknowable Supreme Being, was the demiurge, the agent of creation, not indeed a few thousand years ago in the course of six days, but in the constant procession of things.[1] The Logos was the image of God, the reflection of his glory, the only begotten Son. The Logos was with God, and the Logos was God. Through him all things were made, and in him all things consist. But they exist in him eternally as ideas, and only as such become known to human reason. The Logos in this sense may be said to be the means of creation. It is also the agency of Providence, a conception that played an important part in the Stoic system, and the instrument of revelation. The Logos is the light which illumines every man. There is a distinction between *Logos endiathetos* and *Logos prophorikos.*[2] Native Jewish thought influenced Philo when he described the Logos as angel, servant, high-priest of God, and probably also when he emphasized his importance as leader of the nations, maker and director of history. It has been much discussed whether Philo's Logos is a personality or not. None of the attributes of personality seems to be wanting. Yet a personification is often very intense without implying the belief in a personal entity. If the complexity of the conception points in one direction, the fondness for allegorizing points in another. At any rate, it is certain that Philo could not have conceived of his Logos as incarnated in a historic human personality.

[1] Philo could accept no doctrine of a *creatio ex nihilo.* See Soulier, *La doctrine du Logos chez Philon,* 1876, p. 22.

[2] See Grossman, *Questiones Philoneae,* 1829, II, 26 ff.

This step was taken for the first time, so far as we know, by the author of the Gospel according to John. It is not to be denied that Christian thinkers had before his time been influenced by Philo. This can scarcely be affirmed of Paul. There is nothing specifically Philonic in his doctrine of the preëxistence of the soul in general, or that of the Messiah in particular, in the designation of the Messiah as "the heavenly man," or in the description of the Messiah as the mediator; and the idea of the Messiah emptying himself and becoming a man, if cherished by Paul, was certainly never dreamed of by Philo. But the Christology of the Deutero-Pauline epistles to the Colossians and the Ephesians uses a phraseology that seems to be reminiscent of Philo's language. The Epistle to the Hebrews reveals so great a similarity in method, conceptions and style that a familiarity with Philo seems unquestionable. All the more remarkable is the fact that there Jesus is never identified as the Logos. The only passage in the Apocalypse of John that ascribes the title to Jesus is xix, 13. But the passage has long been recognized as an interpolation. If the name given to him, and unknown to any one else, is the Tetragrammaton, as some scholars think, the author of the interpolation must have written at a date much later than that of the Apocalypse.

The Fourth Evangelist was intimately acquainted with Philonic speculation.[1] The Alexandrian philosopher furnished him not only with ideas but also with his characteristic phraseology. Without Philo his gospel could never have been written. This is true not only of the Prologue but of the whole work. But although his conception of the Logos is essentially that of Philo, it has been modified by two important facts: his Christian ex-

[1] This has been strongly emphasized in the most recent works by Jean Réville, *Le quatrième Evangile*, 1901, and Grill, *Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des viertes Evangeliums*, 1902. The latter scholar has done a service by examining the relative familiarity of Philo and the Fourth Evangelist with Oriental, especially Indian, thought. This acquaintance was, of course, only indirect.

perience and his Gnostic speculation. The former gave him the conviction that the personality of Jesus of Nazareth revealed the eternal nature of the Logos; the latter furnished him with the ideas of an emanation, an appearance in the flesh, and a redemption through gnosis, or insight, an insight which was characteristically mediated through ethical sympathy and loyal love, rather than through intellectual penetration. The result was that, in the Christological development based upon this gospel, the personality of the eternal Logos, the identity of the Logos and the man Jesus, the procession of the Son and the Holy Ghost, the incarnation, and the necessity to salvation of knowing the Father and the Son and their mutual relations, fixed themselves in Christian thought.

While, so far as our present knowledge goes, this was the first clear expression of the incarnation of the divine Logos in Jesus, there are indications that, about the time when the Gospel was written, other minds were occupied by Logos-speculations. Valentinus spoke of a pair of aeons, Logos and Zoe, emanating from the pair Bythos and Sige. Against this doctrine Pseudo-Ignatius took the field, declaring,[1] that "he is his unseen Logos (Word) not proceeding from Sige (Silence)."[2] The Acts of Peter and the Acts of John also operate with the conception in language resembling at times that of the Gospel. But the differences are also very marked. When the wood of the cross is called Logos, it is evident that the idea of an incarnation in the personality of Jesus has not yet become fixed in Christian thought. The same is true of some of the *Logia* found at Behnese. "Lift the stone and thou shalt find me; cleave the wood, and I am there."[3] Such fancies

[1] *Magnesians,* VIII, 2.

[2] The emendation of the text proposed by Zahn, Lightfoot and Harnack, by striking the two words *aidios ouk* (ἀΐδιος οὐκ) has no warrant in the manuscripts, is clearly dictated by an apologetic motive, and leaves a less comprehensible text. The author of the Ignatian Epistle to the Romans was apparently not influenced by the Logos doctrine, though in viii, 2, he tends in that direction.

[3] *Logion,* 4.

disappear after the establishment of the Johannine Christology.

Although Justin Martyr probably wrote his First Apology more than a decade later than the appearance of the Fourth Gospel, it must still be pronounced uncertain whether he was familiar with it. If so, he evidently did not regard it as authoritative. If not, he must have reached somewhat similar ideas concerning the Logos independently, because he addressed himself to philosophers, was acquainted with Gnosticism, and such ideas were in the air. He unquestionably knew Philo. Concerning the Logos Justin taught that he was created as a hypostasis before the world was created, that through him matter itself was made, and that it became flesh, the birth of Jesus from the virgin being his work.

In the apologies of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, the doctrine of the Logos is presented without important new additions. It is noticeable, however, that the Stoic and Philonic distinction between *Logos endiathetos* and *Logos prophorikos* attracts more and more attention, and that the conception of the Logos as indwelling in all men prevents the doctrine of total depravity from developing. The doctrine was naturally defined in controversies with Gnostics, Montanists and other heretics by Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Tertullian's treatment is particularly interesting, as in his Latin translation of the term, he used two words to express its different phases: *verbum* and *ratio*. The Logos idea reached its highest development in Origen. Those great convictions for which he was condemned by the Church were closely connected with it. A strong and growing element in the Church felt the danger lurking in a philosophical conception whose origin, early development and natural implications could not be obscured to men of Greek speech familiar with their great thinkers. The term itself had a tendency to breed faith in human reason, confidence in the divine spark in man, and oppo-

sition to the absolute deity of Jesus and the eternal damnation of the unbelieving. It is significant that, while the Arians freely used the Logos conception, distinguishing as the philosophers of old between the vitalizing, the implicit, and the outgoing Logos, Athanasius protested against the term *Logos spermatikos,* and rejected the distinction made between *Logos endiathetos* and *Logos prophorikos.* At the Council of Nicaea Eusebius and his party proposed the formula: "We believe in the Logos of God." Athanasius and his party objected, favoring the successful formula: "We believe in the Son of God."[1]

The Logos found no place in the ecumenic creeds. It was not adopted as a proper name in the Latin language. It was translated as Word in the modern versions without any hint of its philosophical meaning. To most readers of the Fourth Gospel it had no pre-Christian history. A modern theologian[2] closes his work upon this subject by expressing the conviction that "the Protestant spirit has shown the Logos-theory to be what it is: a religious dream once promising thoughtful men a solution of the problem of God and the universe." He adds that this judgment applies only to its religious phase.

It is readily seen that the problem in philosophy which led some of the subtlest thinkers of antiquity to elaborate the Logos-speculation still remains with us, and that the facts suggested by the term must, on any theory of the universe, continue to claim attention. But even on the religious side the Logos idea has not been an idle dream, but rather a necessary stage in the development of thought. The Semitic nations looked upon the deity as apart from the world. Judaism before its contact with Greek thought and Islam before its contact with Persian mysticism rigidly adhered to this doctrine of the divine transcendence. In India and Greece, and apparently also in Egypt, the conception of a living universe, and of God

[1] Anathon Aall, *Der Logos,* II, 1899, p. 470.
[2] Anathon Aall, *l. c.,* p. 481.

as its life, has taken deep roots. This thought of the divine immanence could not be appropriated by minds accustomed to the idea of an extra-mundane divinity, without the introduction of an intermediate divine being. The incarnate Logos became a school-master leading men to the grander conception of the divine immanence. This was a historical necessity. For pantheism, always exposed to the danger of effacing lines of moral demarcation, was in need of the ethical stimulus of an intensely personal relation to a definite and exalted ideal. It was this deep-seated demand for the highest conceivable ideal that led to the definitions of the "two natures" in Christ. But the introduction of an intermediate deity became harmful by translating the ideal into a sphere of being conceived as possessing an essentially different nature, and therefore putting it beyond the reach of realization or imitation. In the advance of religious thought, the essential oneness of the Life of the universe is perceived, and the moral and religious influence of the life of Jesus becomes enhanced by the recognition of its truly human character.

CHAPTER VIII

THE SECONDARY SOURCES.

Our knowledge of the life and teaching of Jesus is based solely upon the testimony of early Christian literature. From the allusions in pagan and Jewish writers it would be possible to gain some idea, though a very imperfect one, of what Christians believed concerning their Master in the second century. But reliable information as to his life could scarcely be drawn from these sources. Were there no Christian documents, a careful historian might be inclined to credit the statement that the man worshiped as a god by Christian cult-communities in the second century had been put to death in Judaea by Pontius Pilate during the reign of Tiberius. But there would be room for doubt whether this statement rested upon official records or was derived from Christian tradition; it would be impossible to determine what, if anything, had been contributed by "Christus" to the religion named after him; and the silence of the great Jewish writers of the first century would always render a decision precarious.

The only Roman writer of the first century in whose works one would naturally look for an allusion to Christianity is Lucius Annaeus Seneca (4 B. C.-65 A. D.). If, as has been generally supposed, there were disturbances in Rome in which Christians were implicated already at the time of Claudius, and there was a general persecution of Christians by Nero, the silence of the distinguished statesman, the teacher and confidential adviser of Nero, would be peculiar. His ethical, religious and philosophical views were so closely akin to those expressed in the Pauline literature that the similarity attracted attention already in the Early Church. But the correspondence between Paul and Seneca which

most clearly reveals a puzzled consciousness of this kinship is a Christian forgery.[1] There is no reason to believe that Seneca ever heard of Jesus or of Paul. The passage in which, with prophetic indignation, Juvenal[2] describes the sad fate of those who attack "omnipotent rogues" may allude to acts of Nero, but does not in the least suggest that it was Christians who were thus punished for *crimen laesae majestatis.* Among the discourses of Epictetus published by Arrian[3] there is one which contains a mention of "Galileans who by custom hold what cannot be proved by reason and demonstration, that God has made all that is in the world." The emphasis upon the force of national custom and tradition renders it more probable that Epictetus had in mind an ancient people like the Jews, than that he thought of a new sect. The discourse was probably delivered in Nicopolis, Epirus, in 109 A. D. In an oration to the Corinthians probably delivered in the beginning of the reign of Trajan, Dio Chrysostom[4] speaks of people who reject both philosophers and gods. It is not clear, however, that he had Christians in mind.

The first reference to Christianity in a Roman writer seems to be found in a letter by Pliny the Younger to Trajan.[5] The genuineness of this letter has been questioned by many scholars, but on insufficient grounds.[6]. It was prob-

[1] This correspondence was known to Jerome and Augustine and is found in MSS. of Seneca's works since the ninth century. See Baur, *Seneca und Paulus* in *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie,* 1858, p. 463 ff. Cf. E. Westerburg, *Der Ursprung der Sage dass Seneca Christ gewesen sei,* 1881, p. 41 ff.

[2] *Saturnalia,* I, 155 ff.

[3] IV, 7.

[4] *Corinthiacae Orationes,* xxxvii.

[5] *Epistolae,* X, 96.

[6] Semler, in 1788, expressed doubts about the genuineness of X, 96 and 97. Bruno Bauer and Manchot assumed interpolations. The whole collection of Epistles has been questioned by some scholars. This is the position of Van Manen, who, with some force, has urged the difficulty of assuming 124 letters to have passed between Pliny and Trajan in 18 months and of the governor troubling the emperor with so many trifles. Cf. *De Gids,* 1890, p. 290 ff. On the other

ably written in 112 A. D. In it Pliny as governor of Bithynia asks for instructions in regard to the Christians. He has never been present at any examinations of Christians, and is doubtful whether they should be punished without any discrimination as to age or manifest willingness to abandon their practices, and whether the name itself should be punished, or only the crimes found connected with it. From some apostates he had learned that the Christians "were accustomed to assemble on a stated day, before light, and to sing responsively a hymn to Christ, as to a god, and to bind themselves by an oath, not to any wickedness, but not to commit theft, nor robbery, nor adultery, nor prevarication, nor denial of a pledge received, whereupon they would separate, and then come together again for a meal eaten in common." Trajan directed that they should be punished when convicted of being Christians, upon proper trial, but that they should not be hunted out.[1] The phrase "as to a god" probably shows that Pliny understood "*Christus*" to be a man. There is no intimation of any knowledge on his part of the life and teaching of Jesus.

Soon after 115 A. D. Tacitus wrote that part of his historical work which has been designated *The Annals*. In it[2] he mentions the case of Pomponia Graecina, who was accused of a "foreign superstition" in 58 A. D. This has been supposed by some scholars to be a reference to the Christian religion. But Hasenclever[3] has rendered it probable that Judaism is meant. In describing Nero's reign, Tacitus[4] speaks of the persecution of Christians. His ac-

hand, it is extremely difficult to imagine any Christian writer to have gone to the trouble of forging so large a number of epistles for the purpose of introducing a decree which is anything but an edict of toleration. See on this point especially Steck, *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1891, p. 645 ff.

[1] *Plinii Epistolae*, x, 97.

[2] *Ab excessu divi Augusti*, xiii, 32.

[3] *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1882, p. 47 ff.

[4] *l. c.*, XV, 44. There is no reason to doubt that this chapter was written by Tacitus. There may be a question of the accuracy of his information.

count, however, raises some grave questions. Tacitus suggests that to turn the suspicion away from himself, Nero falsely accused the Christians of having caused the great fire at Rome in 64 A. D. The Christians, he says, were named after *Christus*, who in the reign of Tiberius had been put to death by Pontius Pilate. Having been repressed at first, this execrable superstition had broken out afresh, not only in Judaea, but also in Rome, whither all atrocious and shameless things find their way from different parts of the world. Those that were first arrested confessed under torture, and then a large crowd were convicted, not indeed of having caused the fire, but of hatred of the human race. The official charge must of course have been that they had set fire to the city. What "they confessed" cannot have been that they were Christians, but that they had caused the fire. Of this charge, however, the great crowd were not found guilty, but of "*odium generis humani.*" This can scarcely have been a crime recognized by a Roman court. Schmiedel[1] is no doubt right in deeming it possible "that the religion of the accused did not come into question at all, and that Tacitus and Suetonius have, unhistorically, carried back the name *Christiani* from their own time into that of Nero." Curiously enough, Suetonius[2] does not at all say that the Christians were accused of starting the fire; and Juvenal[3] mentions neither incendiarism nor Christian beliefs and practices as the occasion of those barbarous punishments of which these writers seem to have had a tradition. But even if there is reasonable doubt in regard to the Neronic persecution of Christians, and the unfavorable estimate of them by Tacitus is likely to have been derived from his own observation, or the accounts of contemporaries, rather than from a knowledge of their history, the question still remains, whether he may not have gleaned from official reports the fact that Jesus was put to death in the reign of

[1] *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, article *Christian, the name of*, vol. I, col. 758.

[2] *De vita Caesarum*, VI, 16. This work was written ca. 120 A. D.

[3] *l. c.*

Tiberius, while Pontius Pilate was procurator of Judaea. In the present state of our knowledge, it is quite impossible to say, whether a report of the crucifixion of Jesus was sent to Rome by Pontius Pilate, and was seen in the archives there by Tacitus, or whether the historian gathered this piece of information from some Christian source. The probability of such a report depends upon the very uncertain part Pilate had in the tragedy,[1] and the importance he attached to it. There is little reason to believe that the Acts of Pilate referred to by Justin differed essentially from the late forgeries known to us by that name.

Suetonius[2] relates that Claudius (41-54 A. D.) expelled the Jews from Rome because of a tumult they had made under the leadership of one *Chrestus*. As this historian employs the term "*Christiani*" in describing the "new and malicious superstition" against which he had heard that Nero used such drastic measures, there is no reason to suppose that he confused "*Chrestus,*" the Jewish agitator in Rome under Claudius, with "*Christus,*" the prophet appearing in Judaea under Tiberius. But neither can it be affirmed that there was a Roman demagogue by the name of Chrestus in the time of Claudius. There may have been some confusion in the written sources or tradition upon which Suetonius drew. Acts xviii, 1, 2, throws no light upon the subject.

Overbeck[3] has conclusively shown that a number of edicts of toleration ascribed to Hadrian and the Antonines are Christian forgeries. The alleged letter of Hadrian to Minucius Fundanus is no more likely to be genuine than the others. The contrast to Trajan's rescript is very marked. Marcus Aurelius, in his Meditations, refers disapprovingly to the eagerness for martyrdom shown by the Christians.[4] It is possible that Apuleius in 163 A. D. gives a description of Christians, in terms indicating bitter prejudice, though

[1] See Ch. X.

[2] *l. c.*, V, 25.

[3] *Studien zur Geschichte der alten Kirche*, II, 1875.

[4] *Meditationes*, XI, 3.

he does not mention the name.[1] Lucian, of Samosata, in *De morte Peregrini*, written in 178 A. D., shows some acquaintance with Christianity. Concerning the founder of this faith he knew that he was crucified in Palestine. It is not improbable that in his description of Peregrinus he had to some extent the legend of Ignatius in mind.[2] He also appears to have been familiar with the Apocalypse of John.[3] Celsus, in his "*True Account*,"[4] written in 178 A. D., seems to have derived his information partly from the Gospels, including the Fourth Gospel, partly from conversation with Jews. From the latter source he apparently gleaned no additional fact, but only the current Jewish interpretation of the narratives given in the Gospels. It is characteristic of his attitude that he accepted the accounts of miracles wrought by Jesus, though explaining them as performed by magic, and ascribed to him the teaching of the Fourth Gospel as well as the Synoptic representation, while he rejected as legends the stories clustering about his birth, death and resurrection. He does not add a single fact, drawn from any independent source, to what may be gathered from Christian literature.

The most significant fact in extant Jewish writings of the first two centuries is the silence of Philo and Josephus.[5] Philo was still living at the time of the accession of Claudius in 41 A. D. He visited Palestine in connection with his embassy to Gaius Caligula in 40 A. D., and was intimately acquainted with the religious life of Judaea. He was familiar with the various religious parties, Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, but he apparently had no knowledge either of Jesus or of the Christian Church. Still more re-

[1] *Metamorphoses*, IX.

[2] This idea has been expressed by several scholars. Pfleiderer in the second edition of his *Urchristentum* (1902) regards it as an evidence of the genuineness of seven of the Ignatian epistles which he dates ca. 130 A. D. In reality it would only show the development of the Ignatius legend before 178 A. D.

[3] *Vera Historia*, II, 6-12.

[4] See the excerpts in Origen, *Contra Celsum*.

[5] An explanation of this is suggested on page 31.

markable is the absence of any allusion to Christianity in the works of Josephus. The historian of his people lived both in Galilee and in Judaea, was in his youth a seeker after truth wherever it seemed to offer itself, became a member of the Pharisaic party, and described, in his historical works, not only the political fortunes of the Jews, but also to some extent their religious development, and carried his accounts down toward the end of his own life. His "*Jewish War*" was written in its Greek form between 75 and 79 A. D., his "*Antiquities*" in 94 A. D., his work "*Against Apion*" ca. 100 A. D., and his "*Autobiography*" soon after. These works have been preserved by the Church, and not by the Synagogue. Christian readers and copyists could but note with astonishment the fact that Josephus had nothing to say about Jesus. Hence they supplied the text with more or less clumsy interpolations, as patristic testimony and late manuscripts show. A passage inserted in *Antiquities* xviii, 63, 64 reads as follows: "At this time Jesus appears, a wise man, if indeed it is proper to call him a man. For he was a performer of marvelous works, a teacher of men who receive the truth with joy, and he drew to himself many Jews and also many Greeks. He was the Messiah. And when Pilate had punished him by crucifixion, on the accusation of our foremost men, those who had loved him at first did not cease to love him. For he appeared to them alive again after three days, the divine prophets having predicted this and a thousand other wonderful things about him. Even now the people named after him Christians has not ceased to exist." It is admitted on all hands that Josephus cannot have written this paragraph as it stands. A number of scholars have maintained that it contains a genuine nucleus. There is no agreement, however, as to what the historian could have written; and the few words that are left must themselves be subjected to conjectural emendations or fresh modern interpolations to make them at all plausible.[1] It has therefore been the growing conviction

[1] For such attempts see particularly Gieseler, *Kirchengeschichte*, 4te Ausgabe, 1844-1848, p. 81; Wieseler, *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theol-*

of scholars since the sixteenth century that the entire passage is the work of a Christian hand. Origen did not find it in his text of Josephus; but it had been written before Eusebius composed his *Ecclesiastical History* ca. 325 A. D. That the reference to "the brother of Jesus who is called the Christ, James by name"[1] is also a Christian interpolation, is rendered probable by the fact that Origen found in his text of Josephus a passage concerning James not extant in our manuscripts and clearly of Christian origin. Some scholars have assumed that the original text contained an allusion to Jesus so objectionable to Christians that it was removed. There is no basis for such an assumption. The silence of Josephus does not necessarily imply ignorance on his part of Christianity, but only that to his mind it did not possess sufficient importance, either politically or philosophically, to deserve special mention, or that he thought it unwise to refer to the subject. We have the testimony of Photius[2] that Justus of Tiberius in his historical works written toward the end of the first century likewise made no mention of Jesus or Christianity.

In the Mishna, edited by R. Jehuda ca. 200 A. D., the Palestinian Talmud, edited in the time of R. Jose bar Zabda ca. 350 A. D., the Babylonian Talmud, edited by Rab Abina and Rab Jose ca. 500 A. D., as well as in other early Jewish works of uncertain date, there are occasional references to Jesus and the Christians, designated as *Minim.* No authorities of the first century, however, are

ogie, 1878, p. 86 ff.; Volkmar, *Jesus Nazarenus,* 1882, p. 335 ff.; Reinach, *Révue des études juives,* 1897, p. 1. The spuriousness of the entire passage has been shown especially by Gerlach, *Die Weissagungen des Alten Testaments in den Schriften des Flavius Josephus und das angebliche Zeugniss von Christo,* 1863; Keim, *Geschichte Jesu von Nazara,* I, 1867, p. 11 ff.; Loman, *Theologisch Tijdschrift,* 1882, p. 593 ff.; Niese, *De testimonio Christiano quod est apud Josephum,* 1893-1894; Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi,* Leipzig, 1901, vol. I. p. 544 ff.

[1] *Antiquitates,* XX, 200.

[2] *Bibliotheca,* col. 33.

quoted as mentioning either.[1] It is in the reign of Trajan that R. Joshua ben Hananiah[2] speaks of *Minim* and R. Eliezer quoted a legal decision of Jesus on the authority of one of his disciples.[3] According to R. Eliezer's informant, the question had arisen whether it was permissible to bring money gained by prostitution into the temple, and Jesus had decided in the affirmative, citing Micha i, 7 and adding "it has come from uncleanness and it shall go to the place of uncleanness." The genuineness of this saying is highly improbable. But there is good Talmudic authority for the view that in the reign of Trajan a marked hostility existed between Jews and Jewish Christians (Ebionites, Nazaraeans[4]); while this cannot be shown to have existed before his time. In the decades immediately preceding the publication of Celsus's book, the conception of Jesus presented with variations in the Talmudic literature must have shaped itself. There is not the slightest sign that it was based on any other sources than Christian writings. The peculiarity of this Jewish interpretation seems to be due, partly to an honest attempt to discover the historic truth behind what was recognized as legends, partly to an instinctive horror of the new direction Christian thought was taking, partly to a sense of danger to Judaism itself. One cannot doubt that Jewish teachers honestly believed the story of the virgin-birth to be designed to cover up the disgrace of an illegitimate birth, that the reported flight to Egypt indicated the place where Jesus acquired his extraordinary power, that the miracles ascribed to him were actually wrought by magic, that his intimacy with women implied immoral rela-

[1] The silence of R. Jochanan ben Zakkai is most remarkable, as he frequently disputed with Sadducees (*Jadaim*, IV, 6), Boethusians (*Menachot*, 65), and Pagans (*Chullin*, 27, *Bekoroth*, 8).

[2] *Shabbath*, 116a *al.*

[3] *Aboda Zara*, 16b, 17a; *Koheleth rabba* to I, 8; *Josephta Chullin*, ii, 24.

[4] Joel, *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte*, II, 1893, p. 91 ff., is no doubt right in finding "the house of the Ebionites" and "the house of the Nazaraeans, referred to in *Shabbath*, 116a, under the changed form "house of Abidan" and "house of Nazarfa."

tions, that his death as a blasphemer was brought about in accordance with the prescribed methods of judicial procedure. The deification of Jesus, and the practices of some Christian churches, including apparently the use of images, could only be looked upon with alarm. As an ever increasing number of Jews were driven away from Palestine and scattered in the Roman world, there was danger both of their being affected by the tendencies of thought prevailing among Hellenistic Jews and of their abandoning ancestral customs under the pressure of Roman persecution.

Neither Pagan nor Jewish sources give us any reliable information concerning Jesus. Such knowledge as we find can everywhere be traced to Christian sources, with the possible exception of a statement by Tacitus which may have been derived from official Roman records. But the bulk of early Christian literature does not yield much more. The Apologies of Quadratus (ca. 125), Aristides (ca. 129), Aristo of Pella (ca. 135), Justin (ca. 150) and Tatian (ca. 170) present the views of Christian thinkers in the second century; but aside from an occasional saying of Jesus derived from some lost gospel and at least worthy of consideration, they throw no light on the teaching of Jesus. Still less information is to be obtained from such works as The Teaching of the Twelve, a combination of a Jewish writing of uncertain date, called The Two Ways, and a Christian hortatory address, written ca. 150 A. D., The Memoirs of Hegesippus, completed ca. 180 A. D., the Treatise on the Resurrection by Athenagoras, of about the same age, and the fragments of Gnostic commentaries and dissertations that have come down to us. Valuable as are the excerpts of Papias, they do not add a single reliable fact to the knowledge we glean from the Synoptic Gospels. Among the apocalyptic writings of the Early Church the most important seem to be the Revelation of John, the Revelation of Peter, the Revelation of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Sibylline Oracles; but it may be doubted whether any Jewish apocalypse was preserved by the Church without some interpolation, correction, or accidental change. Such

alterations of the original text are plainly visible in the apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra, in the Ethiopic Enoch, in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, in the Testament of Abraham, and in the Jewish Sibylline books. None of the Christian Sibyllists seems to have lived before the second century. Hermas apparently wrote his Shepherd about 150 A. D. The Revelation of Peter was probably composed not much later. It is particularly important for the light it throws upon the influence of Orphic speculation on the development of Christian eschatology. It was highly esteemed at the end of the second century, as is evident from the fact that in the *Muratorianum* it is mentioned side by side with the Revelation of John. Concerning the Revelation of Paul little is known.

The Tübingen school regarded the Revelation of John as the genuine work of John, the son of Zebedee, the immediate disciple of Jesus, and consequently as a document of the primitive Jewish Christianity. This was a serious mistake, as practically all independent students recognize to-day. In its present form, this apocalypse cannot be older than the last years of the reign of Domitian. This has been shown quite conclusively by Harnack.[1] Nevertheless, Baur was right in feeling the presence here and there of a distinctly Jewish spirit. The explanation lies in the fact that some sections, notably chapters xi-xiii, xvii-xviii, seem to have been derived from a previously existing Jewish apocalypse. From different points of view this conviction has been reached by Vischer, Harnack, Gunkel, Wellhausen, Pfleiderer and others. This Jewish apocalypse probably belongs to the time immediately before the conquest of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. Wellhausen is probably right in assigning to the same period the little Apocalypse of Jesus embodied in the Synoptic Gospels (Matth. xxiv, Mark xiii, Luke xxi). It may have formed a part of the work quoted in Luke xi, 49 as "The Wisdom of God." Whether this was originally a Christian product, may be doubted. At any rate, a long

[1] *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, II, 1897, p. 245 ff. It is probable, however, that there are later additions.

period must have passed, as Wellhausen has recognized, before the reference of the personified Wisdom to the murder of Zechariah ben Barachiah, which occurred during the siege of Jerusalem, can have been placed upon the lips of Jesus. A careful criticism can no more use this Synoptic Apocalypse than the Revelation of John as a source of the teaching of Jesus or as coming from his immediate disciples.

Old Christian literature was rich in Acts of the Apostles. There were Gnostic Acts of the Apostles, Ebionitish Acts of the Apostles, Travels of Peter, Travels of Paul, Acts of Paul and Thecla, Travels of James, Travels of John, and others. The Leucine Acts of John are especially interesting, because they show the wider prevalence of the peculiar type of thought found in the Fourth Gospel. An appreciative estimate of this literature has recently been given by Pfleiderer.[1] It is not pretended that any of these works adds to our knowledge of Jesus, or of the thought of his immediate disciples. The canonical Acts brings us far nearer to the beginnings. The compiler of this work introduces himself in the preface as identical with the author of the Third Gospel. Style and literary methods are in harmony with this claim. The Tübingen school found in his presentation of history a conscious purpose to cloak over the differences between Paul and Jewish Christianity. If the genuineness of the Pauline epistles to the Galatians, the Corinthians and the Romans is admitted, no other conclusion seems at first possible, so marked is the contrast between the Paul of these epistles and the Paul of Acts. On the other hand, those who, like Bruno Bauer, Loman, Steck and Van Manen, think it impossible to ascribe these epistles to Paul, and find in Acts a representation of this apostle that is nearer to the historic reality than the radical of the epistles, are as far from making the compiler an impartial and thoroughly reliable historian. Independent scholars are now all agreed as to the inability of the author to place himself objectively in the period he describes, and recognize that this failure is due, not so much to any definite purpose

[1] *Das Urchristentum*[2], 1902.

or tendency, as to the natural prepossessions of his age, and his distance in time from the events related. Hence he was unable to comprehend the nature of the early gift of "speaking with tongues," and caused the apostles to preach in languages they had not acquired, ascribed to them all kinds of miracles, failed to appreciate the conflicts that once must have raged, endowed Peter with the spirit of Paul, and made Paul walk about with a shaven head to show the myriads of believers in Jerusalem his zeal for the Law. He probably wrote in the beginning of the second century.

But it is also generally admitted to-day that he used earlier sources. The first person plural found exclusively in some sections reveals one of these. This "We-Source" rightly ranks among the earliest of our New Testament writings. There is no improbability in the assumption that it was written by one of the companions of Paul, and the most plausible theory is that he was none else than Luke, to whom for this reason the whole book was ascribed, and on account of the preface consequently also the Third Gospel. While this source gives us some information of the most authentic character concerning Paul, it adds nothing, however, to our knowledge of Jesus. Van Manen, who regards Luke as the author of the "We-Source," suggests that in the first part of his work the compiler used two other sources, one being the "Acts of Peter," and the other the "Acts of Paul."[1] Neither of them has been preserved in the original form, and there is every indication that the compiler has used them with the same freedom of modification and expansion that characterizes his gospel, but also with the same retention of early and valuable features of tradition. Thus it is manifest that many legends cluster about the nucleus of fact in his account of the establishment of the church in Jerusalem, and that it would be hazardous to affirm that the time indicated is more correct than the manner described. Yet there is no reason to doubt that the conviction that Jesus had been raised from the dead, and

[1] *De Handelingen der Apostelen,* 1890; *Handleiding voor de oudchristelijke letterkunde,* 1900.

would return on the clouds to restore the kingdom to Israel some time after his death, brought together a group of believers in Jerusalem who, under the influence of his spirit, shared with one another what they had, and lived in accordance with that word of the Master which has been preserved only in Acts: "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

The epistles of the "apostolic fathers," Barnabas, Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, are important for the testimony they bear concerning the religious ideas or ecclesiastical institutions of the period in which they were written, and also for the indications they give, by direct quotation or allusion, of the Christian writings then extant. It is recognized by critics of all schools that the epistle of Barnabas cannot have been written by this companion of Paul, but was composed, probably in Alexandria, in the reign of Hadrian (117-138 A. D.). A number of writings are ascribed to Clement of Rome. The most important among these are two epistles to the church in Corinth, the Homilies and the Recognitions. It is universally admitted that the Homilies and Recognitions are later than the epistles, and of different authorship. The anti-Pauline "Sermons of Peter," one of the sources used, which is carefully to be distinguished from the Pauline "Preaching of Peter," may have been written in its earliest form about 135 A. D. What other sources were employed, what the relation of the Homilies to the Recognitions is, and whether these works, known to Origen, were compiled in the second or in the beginning of the third century, cannot, in the present state of the question, be decided. The second epistle of Clement is also generally regarded as pseudonymous, and Harnack[1] is probably right in considering it as a sermon preached not long before 170 A. D.

The first epistle of Clement does not itself claim to be a work of any man, but to be an epistle of the church of Rome to the church of Corinth. From some fragments of the memoirs of Dionysius of Corinth, written ca. 170 and preserved by Eusebius, it is evident that it was then supposed

[1] *Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur*, II, 1897, p. 438 ff.

in Corinth that the first epistle was written by Clement. Dionysius probably assumed that it must have been written by the bishop of Rome at the time of the disturbance in the Corinthian church, and that Clement then held that office. This may have been the view of his contemporaries in Rome, as excerpts from Hegesippus in Eusebius show. The source of both statements may have been a list of Roman bishops drawn up, as Harnack has shown, not long before the time of Hegesippus, and apparently used by Irenaeus in 180. This list mentioned the Corinthian disorder and the dispatch of the letter as occurring in the time of Bishop Clement. But it has been conclusively proved that the monarchical episcopate did not exist in Rome before Anicetus (156-166). "Bishop Clement" seems to be a creation of a later time, based on the mention of an otherwise unknown Clement in Philippians iv, 3, or on the vague memory of Consul Flavius Clemens, put to death by Domitian for "atheism," Jewish leanings and neglect of duty, or a confusion of both. That the Consul cannot have written this epistle is clear from the fact that the author was manifestly a Jew. There is no allusion to Gnostic heresies, and no sign of the monarchical episcopate in the epistle. But both of these phenomena appeared later in Rome than in the East. The author was apparently familiar with I Peter, which was written at the end of Trajan's reign. A date about 120-125 is most probable.

Fifteen epistles have been ascribed to Ignatius of Antioch. Two to John, and one to the Virgin Mary, are extant only in Latin, and were published in 1495. They are universally rejected. Of the other twelve there is a longer and a shorter recension. The former is represented by the Latin text published in 1498, the Greek text published in 1557, and the Armenian text published in 1783 and 1849. It contains, in addition to a letter sent by Mary of Cassobola (Castabala?) before the departure of Ignatius for Rome, his answer to her, written in Antioch, the epistles to the churches in Ephesus, Magnesia on the Maeander, Tralles, and Rome, written in Smyrna, the epistles to Philadelphia,

Smyrna, and Polycarp, written in Troas, the epistles to Tarsus, Antioch and Deacon Hero of Antioch, written in Philippi, and the epistle to the church in Philippi, sent from Rhegium in Italy. The latter recension is represented by an Anglo-Latin version published by Usher in 1644, containing the same works, though shorter in some of the epistles, and the Greek Codex Mediceus, ending in the middle of the ninth epistle, published by Isaac Voss in 1646. In 1845 a Syriac text, containing the epistles to Polycarp, Ephesians and Romans, was published by Cureton. Especially the letter to the Ephesians is much shorter than in either of the Greek recensions.

All Ignatian epistles were rejected as spurious by Flacius, Calvin, Chemnitz, Dallaeus, Scaliger and others. An important distinction was made in 1623 by Vedelius who called attention to the fact that only seven epistles were known to Eusebius, and rejected all but these. Since then a practical agreement has been reached among scholars, Catholic and Protestant alike, that the epistles to Mary of Cassobola, the Tarsians, the Antiochenes, Hero, and the Philippians, falsely claim to have been written by Ignatius. None of them can be earlier than the beginning of the third century, and the Philippians is evidently much later; but the ignorance of Eusebius or his source in regard to them does not necessarily show that they belong to the fourth century. Only three of the seven epistles known to Eusebius are quoted by earlier writers. Curiously enough, these are precisely the three epistles to the Ephesians, the Romans and Polycarp, which are found in the Syriac version, published by Cureton. The epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp is mentioned in a spurious addition to Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians, that to the Romans was known to Irenaeus, and that to the Ephesians to Origen. But even this earliest collection of three epistles seems to have had a gradual growth. The epistle to the Romans is different in style and character from all the others, and appears to be the earliest. The letter to Polycarp is clearly later. Ephesians seems to have

been expanded by the hand that wrote Magnesians, Trallians, Philadelphians and Smyrnaeans.

Romans is evidently the starting point of this Ignatian epistolary literature. There is as yet no sign of the great interest of the later epistles: prevention of the spread of Gnostic heresies and inculcation of obedience to the bishop. The absence of any allusion to the authority of the bishop is all the more remarkable, if the monarchical episcopate, in the other epistles deemed of such importance that no church can be conceived without it, was still unknown in Rome. The whole emphasis is on the eagerness of Ignatius to become a martyr, and his anxiety lest the intercession of the Romans prevent the fulfilment of his desire. This is intelligible in the first effort to write in the name of Ignatius and presupposes only the legend which carried him to Rome to suffer his martyrdom there, and the development of that morbid aspiration for martyrdom to which Marcus Aurelius, Celsus and Caecilius in the Octavius of Minucius Felix refer. How early the legend of his Roman martyrdom started, we do not know. It is possible that Lucian in his work *De morte Peregrini*, written 178 A. D., draws upon the story of Ignatius for his sketch of Proteus Peregrinus, the philosopher who publicly burnt himself to death in Olympia in 165 A. D. All critics admit that by that time the seven epistles are likely to have been in existence. But the legend rests on no solid foundation; it is manifestly an imitation of Paul's journey, and can be shown to be a fiction by absolutely unimpeachable historic testimony. Johannes Malalas, the Antiochene historian, on the basis of some good old source, states that Ignatius suffered martyrdom, not in Rome, but in Antioch, in December, 115 A. D., when Trajan was in the city, and the fact is independently vouched for by a Syrian chronographer. The more this statement contrasts with the reigning tradition in the church, and the more difficult it is to conceive of a motive for its invention, the more the conviction forces itself upon us that this is the historic truth. Neither Romans alone, nor the three Syriac epistles, nor the seven known to Eusebius, nor the twelve

found in the Greek manuscripts, any more than the whole number of fifteen ascribed to Ignatius, can be regarded as genuine. Some who have maintained the genuineness of the seven have been willing to go as late as to 130 and even 140 A. D., assuming Ignatius to have been living as long as that. The fourth decade of the second century is not improbable.

While it may not be capable of strict proof, there is no good reason why the main part of the epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians should not have been written by the Bishop of Smyrna who suffered martyrdom in 166 A. D. When the epistle was written is uncertain, but probably not before the middle of the century. It was known to Irenaeus in the reign of Commodus (180-192 A. D.). Ch. xiii, not found in the Greek text, parts of ch. ix, and other sections, are interpolations.

Seven so-called Catholic Epistles in the New Testament are ascribed to immediate disciples or brothers of Jesus. It would be of the profoundest interest to the historian, if it could be shown that ecclesiastical tradition was right in regarding two brothers of Jesus as the authors of the epistles of James and Jude. How much information concerning his early life they must have possessed! What light their manner of thought and speech would throw upon his! But there is not the slightest indication in the epistle of James that the writer, who styles himself "a servant of God and of Jesus Christ," either was, or endeavored to speak in the name of, the brother of Jesus. Jacob was a common name among the Jews. The author was a Hellenistic Jew, to whom the church was the new Israel, the question of the validity of the letter of the law and the perpetuity of the cult no longer existed, the one-sidedness, artificiality and tendency to anti-nomianism in the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith were painfully apparent, the highest ethical demands of the law and the "golden rule" of Jesus formed together the "royal law of liberty," and the social and economic inequalities constituted the gravest danger of the church. The epistle was probably written ca. 150 A. D.

Jude presents itself as an epistle written by a brother of

James. By James, no doubt the brother of Jesus, the head of the church in Jerusalem, is meant. This cautious term seems to have been occasioned by the idea that Jesus cannot have had any real brothers. The author is far removed from the apostolic age. He looks back and calls to mind "the words spoken aforetime by the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ." The heretics he combats seem to belong to the Gnostic school of Carpocrates, or his son Epiphanes. His quotations from Enoch are not decisive of his date, as we do not know whether chs. xxxvii-lxxi formed a part of the volume with which he was acquainted. The epistle can scarcely have been written before 150 A. D.

Five epistles are assigned by tradition to immediate disciples of Jesus, three to John, and two to Peter. I John makes no claim for itself. It was evidently ascribed to the apostle John, chiefly because of its unmistakable similarity to the Fourth Gospel. The decision in regard to that Gospel necessarily affects the epistle, whether it is placed immediately before or after the greater work. The most probable view is that it was written later than the Gospel, not long after 140 A. D. by a disciple of the evangelist, possibly in his name. II and III John were reckoned among the antilegomena and, like Jude and II Peter, not found at all in the early Edessene Bible. They were probably written by the same man, ca. 150 A. D. Whether he meant to convey the impression that he was the "Presbyter John," whom Papias knew as a contemporary of Aristion and a different man from the apostle John, is doubtful. He does not give his name.

I Peter claims to be an epistle of Peter to the dispersion, *i. e.*, the scattered Christians in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia. Its object is to encourage them to suffer patiently persecution for the Christian name. The epistle shows a marked dependence upon some of the Pauline epistles, including Hebrews. The earliest persecution known to have affected this region is that under Trajan to which the letters of Pliny bear testimony. The epistle was probably written not far from 117 A. D. II Peter

claims to be the work of Peter, an eye-witness of the transfiguration, and the writer of the first epistle. It is recognized by all critical students that the claim is false. It was probably written about 170 A. D. Instead of being the precious words of brothers and disciples of Jesus, these epistles are the utterances of men who lived from eighty to one hundred and thirty years after his death, full of interest and vital truth, but throwing no light on his life or teaching.

Fourteen epistles have been ascribed to Paul. That to the Hebrews, already doubted by Carlstadt, Grotius, Semler, and others before the nineteenth century, and to-day universally regarded as by another author than Paul, was probably written in Rome toward the end of Trajan's reign, somewhat earlier than I Peter.. The so-called pastoral epistles, I and II Timothy and Titus, were not included in Marcion's collection of Pauline epistles. The genuineness of I and II Timothy was doubted by J. E. C. Schmidt, that of I Timothy by Schleiermacher, and that of all three by Eichhorn and De Wette, but Baur caused the spuriousness of these epistles to be recognized by all independent investigators. The attempts of Harnack and others to save a few lines have not been convincing. The Gnostic heresies rebuked in II Timothy and Titus seem to be less advanced and the bishops are not yet clearly differentiated from the presbyters. It therefore seems probable that these epistles were written in the reign of Hadrian. I Timothy apparently refers to Marcion's famous book entitled "Antitheses" in warning against "the antitheses of a gnosis falsely so called," and it is familiar with the monarchical episcopate, though the place of writing seems to be Rome. I Timothy may on this account be regarded as written some twenty years later.

Among the so called "letters of the captivity," Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon form a group apparently coming from the same period. The genuineness of the "twin-epistles," Ephesians and Colossians, was questioned already by Evanson, that of Ephesians by Usteri, De Wette, Schleiermacher and Schwegler, and that of Colossians espe-

cially by Mayerhoff, before Baur more fully exhibited the situation they reflect. In Marcion's collection, Ephesians was addressed to the Laodiceans; many eminent scholars have held that it originally had no address at all. It is a homily on the unity of the Church. The author looks back upon "the holy apostles" as the foundation of the church. He is influenced by Gnostic ideas. I Peter, Acts and I Clement were apparently known to him. The type of thought is earlier than that in the Johannine writings. The epistle seems to have been used by the authors of the Teaching of the Twelve, Hermas, Second Clement and Polycarp, and written about 130 A. D. Colossians reveals the same Gnostic affinities, the same speculations about celestial hierarchies, the same Christology, the same conception of the Church. The false Gnosticism combated seems, however, to be of a somewhat different character, legalistic, ascetic, probably Ebionitish. This accounts for the similarity in some places to the language of the earliest epistles, which some scholars have sought to explain by the theory of a genuine nucleus expanded by the author of Ephesians. Philemon is closely akin to Colossians, as Baur recognized. Eph. i, 15-17 and Col. i, 4 are used in vss 4-6, as Holtzmann has shown; the question of slavery is much discussed in precisely these three epistles; the same persons receive greetings in Colossians and Philemon. Steck has rightly urged against its genuineness the improbability of a Phrygian slave running away either to Caesarea or to Rome, and being sent back all the way to Phrygia, and of the promise made by the prisoner to pay Philemon for his loss. He regards Pliny's letters to Sabinian on behalf of a freedman as having furnished the model. But it is not improbable that there existed a tradition to the effect that Paul had sent back a runaway slave. Colossians and Philemon are probably a little later than Ephesians.[1]

[1] The ablest defense of the genuineness of the Epistles to the Colossians and Philemon is that by J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 1875. But it fails to do full justice to the arguments that may be urged against this assumption.

The epistle to the Philippians differs radically from the group just considered. Baur and Bruno Bauer saw indications of Gnostic ideas in ii, 6 ff.; but the passage may easily be an interpolation, and Holsten's interpretation renders the Gnostic character doubtful. There is reason for identifying the Clement of iv, 3 with the hypothetical author of one or both of the Roman homilies sent to Corinth. Holsten's examination of this epistle is a perfect model of the cautious and comprehensive, fair and searching criticism in which he excelled. He was led to reject its authenticity and yet at the same time to assume that it was written not long after the death of Paul.[1] The advance beyond the ideas of the great epistles on which he based his conclusion is indeed noticeable, but it is scarcely more marked than that from Galatians to Romans, and is in the same direction. Van Manen objects to Holsten's method of comparing Philippians with four epistles quietly assumed to be genuine. If Holsten never examined the genuineness of these epistles, because even Baur had left them unquestioned, he was indeed at fault. Science assumes nothing, is in honor bound to question every tradition. But if an examination utterly indifferent to the correctness of ecclesiastical tradition or the prevailing views at any time should find reasons for believing that some of these epistles, or the earliest forms of some of them, are genuine, it would be both legitimate and necessary to use them as criteria. The absence of the Gnostic element, the prominence of the fundamental problems of the earlier letters, even with a calmer discussion of them, and the marked similarity of style, must then be determining. That is Van Manen's own method. It is certainly not in Philippians itself he has found the reasons for assigning this epistle to so late a date as 125-150 A. D. He has placed it there, because, on grounds less apparent in this than any other epistle, he has come to the conviction that the entire Pauline literature was written at that time. Philippians was probably written by Paul ca. 63 A. D. in Rome.

[1] *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie,* 1875 and 1876.

The genuineness of I Thessalonians was apparently suspected already by the author of II Thessalonians. In modern times Baur, Volkmar, Holsten, Steck, Van Manen, and others have indicated many reasons for regarding it as spurious. The language used seems to presuppose a longer existence of the church in Thessalonica than only a few months; the fierce denunciation of the Jews is all the more strange if, contrary to Acts xvii, pagans converted from their idols are addressed; "the wrath that has already come upon them to the end" can scarcely refer to anything else than the destruction of Jerusalem; "the words of the Lord" concerning his coming seem to have been drawn from some apocalypse of the type that flourished in the reign of Domitian. The early part of Trajan's reign is the most probable date. As for II Thessalonians, the conclusions of J. E. C. Schmidt, Mayerhoff, De Wette, Baur and his school have only been strengthened by the most recent studies of the epistle by Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Pfleiderer, Wrede and Hollmann. The advanced form of the Antichrist legend, the suspicion cast on I Thessalonians in spite of the unconscious imitation of its language, and the reference to the greetings written in Paul's own hand as a sign of genuineness, are decisive. On the other hand, the absence of any sign of Gnosticism should be noted. The epistle was probably written ca. 110 A. D.

The most burning question in new Testament isagogics at the present time concerns the genuineness of the four epistles, Galatians, I and II Corinthians and Romans, that were regarded by Baur and the Tübingen school as the work of Paul. The doubts in regard to Romans expressed by Evanson[1] had attracted little attention. Sixty years later Bruno Bauer[2] presented his reasons for believing that the entire Pauline literature was written in the second century. In 1877 he particularly emphasized the relation of the Pauline thought to that of Seneca and the Stoics.[3] The next year

[1] *The Dissonance of the four generally received Evangelists,* 1792.
[2] *Kritik der Paulinischen Briefe,* 1850-1852.
[3] *Christus und die Caesaren,* 1877.

Allard Pierson[1] was led to reject the Pauline epistles as spurious. Of greater importance were the careful and methodical studies that A. D. Loman[2] began to publish in 1882. His treatment of the external evidence was especially convincing. Marcus Joel[3] accepted his conclusions as to the spuriousness of all the Pauline epistles, and used effectively the scanty Talmudic material to show that there was a long period of comparatively friendly relations between the believers in Jesus as the coming Messiah and the other members of the Jewish community before the final break came. J. C. Matthes, F. Van Loon, H. U. Meyboom, J. A. Bruins adopted the views of Loman. In 1888 Rudolf Steck[4] wrote a commentary on Galatians from the new point of view. The ablest and most indefatigable defender of this position since 1888 has been Van Manen.[5] His articles in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* have brought the question to the fore in the English speaking world, where W. B. Smith[6] has also championed the second century origin of the Pauline epistles. Most recently, the origin of these epistles in the second century and in Rome has been maintained by A. Kalthoff[7] in his attempt to understand Christianity as an expression of a peculiar social rather than individual consciousness, the aspiration and upward movement of the Jewish slave proletariat in Rome.

The following are the most important arguments urged by these scholars and thinkers in favor of their view. There is no external evidence of the existence of any Pauline epistle before the second century. These writings are not letters in any strict sense, the epistolary form being nothing but a literary device. It is impossible to maintain their unity, and most natural to look upon them as compilations of already existing literary material. Almost all

[1] *De bergrede en andere synoptische fragmenten*, 1878.

[2] *Questiones Paulinae* in *Theologische Tijdschrift*, 1882, 1883, 1886.

[3] *Blicke in die Religionsgeschichte*, II, 1883.

[4] *Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Echtheit untersucht*, 1888.

[5] *De Brief aan die Romeinen*, 1891; *De brieven aan de Korinthiers*, 1896.

[6] *Hibbert Journal*, 1903, and elsewhere.

[7] *Das Christusproblem*, 1902.

other epistles of this kind are pseudonymous. A number of epistles that claim to be by Paul have been generally recognized as spurious. There is no such difference between the four and the rest as to justify the opinion that more than half a century lies between them. The author of Acts does not seem to be acquainted with them. The character and teaching of Paul, according to these epistles, are very different from the representation given in Acts, which does not suggest a radical who has broken completely with Judaism. A teacher more in harmony with the immediate disciples of Jesus is to be expected rather than a radical and a reformer so soon after the establishment of Christianity. The author of the epistles was manifestly influenced by Seneca, if not by Epictetus. The class consciousness of the proletariat speaks through him. It is inconceivable that a stranger should address the church of Rome as he does, and one does not get any definite conception of the conditions of this church or its membership. The appearance of the radical of the epistles twenty-five years after the death of Jesus could be explained only by a psychological miracle, as impossible as the physical miracle by which tradition explains it.

It should be granted at once that it is not possible to prove by external evidence the existence of any Pauline epistle in the first century. Those theologians are easily satisfied who refer to the mention of a Pauline epistle by Marcion as "the best possible external evidence." A great deal may happen in eighty years. The genuineness of the principal epistles must therefore be decided solely on internal grounds. It should also be freely admitted that, in the absence of competent external testimony, only a high degree of probability, but never absolute certainty, can be reached. It ought to be needless to remark that, in a matter thus necessarily left to the subjective judgment of the investigator, dogmatism and impatience with dissenting views are wholly out of place. Are these epistles letters at all? The personal communications found among Egyptian papyri are very different. On the other hand, numerous examples of epistles

clearly intended for a larger circle of readers or hearers have come to us. Many of these unquestionably were pseudepigrapha written in the name of distinguished men with the whole epistolary apparatus of personal references and greetings. What we would call an essay, a treatise, a tract very often took this form. But this furnishes no ground for doubting that such a discussion of important questions was occasionally sent by a religious propagandist in the form of an epistle to a cult society in whose welfare he was deeply interested. The epistles of Seneca often read like treatises. Why should not Paul's?

It is of course true that the absolute integrity of the four epistles cannot be maintained. The older they are, the less likely are they to have come down to us in their original form. The longer the period was that elapsed before they began to enjoy canonical authority, the more the text must have suffered through careless copying. The less accustomed to a cautious and reverent handling of holy scriptures the circles were through which they passed, the more probability is there of changes, corrections and additions. It would be unreasonable to expect of Hellenistic Jews, fresh converts from paganism and Gnostic Christians such accuracy in the transmission of epistles, not claiming in any way to be inspired oracles, as the Palestinian Jews were just learning to secure by various artificial means in the case of recognized Scriptures. Van Manen has conclusively shown that Marcion possessed an earlier form of Galatians than the somewhat expanded Catholic epistle. But his copy had no doubt already been interpolated. Signs of correcting pens are seen in the story of Hagar and Sinai. The whole allegorical interpretation is likely to be an interpolation. It can scarcely be earlier than the fall of Jerusalem and the carrying away of captives in 70 A. D. Baur[1] recognized that Romans xv and xvi are a later addition. Straatman[2] is probably right in regarding xii-xiv as such.

[1] Semler and Eichhorn had already espoused the view that these chapters, though by Paul, did not originally belong to this epistle.

[2] *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1868, p. 38 ff.

The account of the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection in I Corinthians xv, 5-11 seems to be a later insertion. Only a very searching literary criticism will be able to discover what the original form of II Corinthians was. Gradual corruption and enlargement belong to the literary vicissitudes of all ancient manuscripts. But Van Manen's theory that these epistles are compilations does not seem probable. In the writing of history this was the common method. But why should the writer of an epistle be supposed to draw upon a new literary source every time he changes his subject? And where would his literary material come from? In what form would these little fragments have existed before?

There is much force in the consideration that none of the epistles ascribed to Peter and John, James and Jude, Clement and Barnabas, Ignatius and Hermas can be regarded as genuine, and that some Pauline letters must be rejected. But there are genuine epistles as well as fictitious ones that have come down from pagan antiquity. There would be a special reason for writing epistles in the name of the immediate disciples of Jesus and his brothers, if there existed epistles of Paul, and the writing of more epistles in his name would be natural, if a few had at least enjoyed a long prestige.

Whether the difference between Galatians and Ephesians is such as to demand sixty years between them, is a question not easily answered. But it must be apparent to every student that the world of thought into which the former ushers us is altogether different from that of the latter. Has the Law eternal validity? Must a Gentile believer in Jesus as the Messiah be circumcised? Must he keep the distinction between clean and unclean food? Must he observe the sabbath? Must he abstain from meat offered to idols? These are the questions that occupy the minds of the Galatians. They were not of a speculative, but of an entirely practical nature. They must have arisen as soon as followers of Jesus began to proclaim his gospel in the Hellenistic world. It was not among the Aramaic-speaking

Christians of Palestine that these questions would be likely to cause a disturbance, but among the Greek-speaking Jews, who would naturally be divided among themselves. How long the conflict must have raged over these fundamental issues before they were driven into the background, we have no means of determining. But the time indicated does not seem excessive. When Ephesians was written, the Church has been completely severed from the mother-body, and the Gnostic speculations occupy the minds of the Christians. The preparation for this may be seen in Acts, where the older apostles have been unconsciously assimilated to Paul, and Paul brought into more harmonious relations to them. It is impossible to say whether the author knew any letter of Paul. A letter somewhere in Galatia, two or three in Greece, and one in Italy, even a number of copies scattered here and there in these churches, may very well have escaped his attention. And if he had read any of them, it is likely to have been uncritically and in the light of the traditions, conditions, and impressions of his own age.

It is right to maintain that these epistles must be placed, regardless of tradition, where they belong in the development of religious thought. Declamations against the theory of natural evolution will have no effect. If the larger Pauline epistles can be explained naturally as a product of second century conditions, and as the work of Paul only by a physical or psychical miracle, there should be no more hesitancy in regard to them than in the case of the Fourth Gospel or the Catholic Epistles. But in tracing the natural development it is necessary to observe the different tendencies of life and thought within Judaism, and their unavoidable continuance among the Jews who became Christians. The very fact that they used the Greek language, were in constant contact with Greeks, and lived at a distance from temple and cult, exposed Hellenistic Jews to influences of thought not felt at all, or at least not so directly, by Aramaic-speaking Jews living in Palestine. So also the very fact that they spoke Aramaic, heard the Hebrew Scriptures read, lived in the midst of their native institutions, and were

bound up with the national life, tended to make the Palestinian Christians conservative. An outbreak of radicalism is as natural in a Hellenistic Jew as a keen resentment against it on the part of Aramaic-speaking Jews in Judaea, even if they had learned to look for the return of Jesus as the Messiah. It is not legitimate to ask whether the thought of Galatians can have developed in twenty-five years from the faith of the Galilean disciples of Jesus immediately after his death. The answer to this question must of course be in the negative. Behind the larger Pauline epistles lies the world of thought in which an educated Hellenistic Jew lived, the world of Philo and of Seneca. The Paul of these epistles is no more a miracle than is Philo, whose philosophy cannot be explained by the book of Jubilees or the Pirqe Aboth. A correct instinct led an early Christian to forge a correspondence between Paul and Seneca. Bruno Bauer was also right when he divined a relation between the Stoic thought of Seneca and Paulinism. Pfleiderer,[1] with true insight, calls attention to this philosophico-religious atmosphere which must have existed in Tarsus, the native town of Paul, in the first half of the first century. The great tendencies of thought and life are there before they find expression in a Philo, a Seneca, or a Paul. It is also vain to ask whether a convert can become at once a reformer of the faith he has embraced. That depends entirely upon his character and the stage of development of the faith. If his conversion meant a long stride from his former position, the impetus that brought him there may easily carry him further. If the cause with which he identified himself was itself in its infancy, and seemed to him to imply a larger principle than its defenders recognized, there is nothing improbable in such a radicalism at the outset. In the case of Paul, however, it was not until after years of reflection that he seems to have appeared with his new interpretation of the Gospel, based on the universalistic tendency so natural to a Hellenistic Jew. The more earnestly it is attempted to understand the actual evolution of Paulinism, the more im-

[1] In *Urchristentum*[2], 1902.

perative it becomes to postulate a marked personality, in whom the tendencies of Hellenistic Judaism and Palestinian Pharisaism met, and took a new direction under the influence of a strong and peculiar Messianic conviction. His appearance must have been followed, it would seem, by a long conflict over just the issues most clearly seen in Galatians. Finally, these issues could only be retired by the gradual separation of the Christian church from its original ethnic connection. Such a personality is suggested by the earlier sources of Acts; such a conflict this historic work cannot conceal; such a shifting of the interest and the viewpoint the author clearly manifests. In view of such facts as are known to us, it remains most probable that the epistles to the Galatians, the Corinthians and the Romans were written by Paul between 56 and 60 A. D.

What evidential value, so far as the life and teaching of Jesus are concerned, have the five epistles that may thus be ascribed to Paul? In view of the reasonable doubts as to the integrity of the present text, they must be used with great caution, and details cannot be pressed. It may be inferred, however, that in the reign of Nero there were Christian cult-communities in Syria, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome, in which the founder of the faith, Jesus, was believed to have been a martyr, crucified in Judaea, to have been raised again from the dead on the third day according to the Hebrew Scriptures, and to be ready to return soon as the Messiah. Concerning the nature of his Messiahship, and the effect of his death and resurrection upon the Jewish law, there were in these societies wide differences of opinion. Paul himself maintained that Jesus had existed before his earthly life as the celestial and archetypal man, that his death revealed the insufficiency and temporary character of the law, and freed the believer from all obligation to its carnal commandments, and that his resurrection proved him now to be the Son of God, the Lord of a new dispensation destined to end only with the subjection of all things to God, and the Spirit of Life, whose inwardly operating law brings about the moral perfection which the Bible as an external

authority could not accomplish. While these views were shared by many Hellenistic Jews who had embraced the new faith, and their general tendency was agreeable to converted pagans, however strange some of the Pauline conceptions and methods of reasoning may have seemed to them, it is evident from the epistles that the mother-church in Jerusalem looked upon Jesus as a prophet, mighty in word and deed, who had been put to death by the rulers, but had been raised by God and preserved in heaven, until the day when he should appear as the Messiah to establish the kingdom of Israel, and upon his death and resurrection as having no effect on the validity of the law and the sacred customs enjoined by it, such as circumcision, tabus, and festivals. Aside from the crucifixion, not a single fact in the life of Jesus can be gleaned from these epistles, nor do they record a single saying of Jesus. With the uncertainty that rests on the historical character of the Caesarean imprisonment, the statements in Acts from which the duration of his missionary journeys has been computed, and the interpretation of the fourteen-year period mentioned in Galatians, it is quite impossible to determine how many years before his appearance before Festus (60-62) Paul had the vision which convinced him that Jesus had been raised from the dead, and, in spite of his crucifixion, was the Messiah. It cannot have been many years, however, after the death of Jesus. There is no intimation that the disciples of Jesus had not already reached the conviction that Jesus had been raised from the dead on the third day according to the Scriptures, but rather probable that statements to this effect constituted the psychological preparation of Paul for his ecstatic experience. If, therefore, little light is thrown by the Pauline epistles upon the life and teaching of Jesus, they are nevertheless of great value as testimonies of one who, though he did not know Jesus personally, knew his immediate disciples, and cannot have been mistaken in regard to his historic existence in his own life-time and a few years before his conversion, and also in reference to the early appearance of the two ideas that Jesus had been raised from the dead and that he would return to earth on the clouds of heaven.

CHAPTER IX

THE GOSPELS

Many gospels that were read and cherished by Christians in the second century failed to maintain their hold upon the developing Catholic Church and to find a place in its canon of Scriptures. The most important of these seem to have been the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel according to the Ebionites, the Gospel according to the Egyptians, and the Gospel according to Peter. The Gospel according to the Hebrews appears to have existed both in its original Hebrew or Aramaic form and in a Greek translation. Jerome claims to have seen and translated it. But his translation is lost, and the quotations do not permit us to form a true estimate of its character. That it was not identical with our Gospel according to Matthew is clear both from the quotations and from the fact that he felt it necessary to undertake a translation. Whether it was written in Hebrew or in Aramaic is uncertain. In the former case it would probably be itself a translation. If Jerome had before him an Aramaic original, it is more likely to have been a descendant of an early Palestinian gospel. This is, on the whole, most probable. But it is, of course, unsafe to infer from quotations of peculiar statements what this gospel may have been in its original form. During three centuries of use it had naturally gathered many interpolations and accretions. Still less dependence can be placed on a Greek version even in the time of Clement of Alexandria. There is nothing to prevent the assumption that the Gospel according to the Hebrews in its earliest form was a copy of the first written Aramaic gospel. But at present

this is not capable of proof. The altogether trustworthy narrative in John vii, 53-viii, 11, seems to have been taken from this gospel; but whether the Fourth Evangelist himself introduced it, or anywhere else used this source, is doubtful. It is equally uncertain whether the gospel in any form was known to Justin Martyr. The Gospel according to the Ebionites seems to be a later production. The relations of this work in its earlier forms to the Gospel according to the Hebrews cannot be determined. It is perhaps hazardous to draw any conclusions as to the general character of the Gospel according to the Egyptians from the one extant quotation. But it seems safe to infer that it was originally written in Greek and that it reflected Hellenistic tendencies. Harnack is probably right in ascribing to the same milieu, if not to this gospel itself, the collections of "Sayings of Jesus" recently found in Egypt. There is not the slightest reason to suppose that any of these is genuine.

Of more immediate importance is the Gospel according to Peter. A fragment of this work was discovered at Akhmim, Egypt, in 1892. But it was probably written in Syria. Serapion of Antioch (ca. 200 A. D.) refers to it; and Harnack[1] has shown that Justin Martyr used it. The author was apparently familiar with the Synoptics, but used them with great freedom and drew upon the stream of oral tradition. He was not acquainted with the Fourth Gospel. There is no indication of Gnosticism, and its docetic tendency is not sufficiently marked to make it a heretical gospel. Besides, a distinction between Catholic and sectarian gospels did not exist in the period before Justin Martyr. Some relatively ancient features have been preserved in this gospel. Thus Jesus is crucified by the Jews, and his disciples return to Galilee before they have seen their risen Master. His first appearance to them in Galilee must therefore have been told in the

[1] *Bruchstücke des Evangeliums und der Apokalypse des Petrus*[2], 1893, p. 37 ff.

lost conclusion to the gospel.[1] On the other hand, there are also some very late features. The gospel seems to have been written between 130 and 150 A. D. The Gospel according to Nicodemus, the *Protevangelium Jacobi*, and other gospels of the infancy, are late works possessing no historical value.

From the time of Irenaeus the four Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, Luke and John have enjoyed greater authority than all others. A distinction must be made, however, between the Fourth Gospel and the Synoptics. In regard to the former there was a difference of opinion already in the Early Church. A party called the Alogi rejected it as spurious at the very time when the first external evidence of its existence is found. These Alogi were not heretical innovators, but conservatives who looked upon the application of the Logos-conception to Jesus as a new and dangerous doctrine. Whether they had any sympathizers in the Middle Ages is not known. The German and Swiss reformers did not question either the authorship or the historical accuracy of the Fourth Gospel. But we have the testimony of Giuliano of Milan, given before the Inquisition and preserved in its official records,[2] to the effect that the Baptists in Italy did not regard it as of apostolic origin and authority. If the liberty of conscience for which they fought had been accorded to them, we might have learned the reasons for their faith, and the world would not have had to wait a quarter of a millennium for a truer estimate of this gospel. A century of labor has at last established it. Through the insight and research of such men as Evanson, Horst, Bretschneider, Bruno Bauer, Strauss, Schwegler, Baur, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Scholten, Albert Ré-

[1] That the author knows no appearance of Jesus on Easter Sunday is important, showing, as Harnack remarks (*l. c.*, p. 62), that "on this important point we have in the Gospel acording to Peter a tradition that is older than Matthew, Mark, Luke and John."

[2] See especially *Revista Christiana*, 1885, and Comba, *I nostri protestanti*, 1897, II, 488 ff.

ville, Thoma, Pfleiderer, Weizsäcker, Cassels, Sihmiedel, Van Manen, Jean Réville, Spitta, Harnack, Bacon, Fries, Kreyenbühl and Grill, not to mention others, the character of the gospel has become increasingly manifest. There are many problems left, but they are of wholly subordinate value. Whether the external or the internal evidence is considered, the results are the same. It is not the work of the apostle John; it is a product of the second century; it cannot be used independently as a source from which to derive knowledge concerning the life and teaching of Jesus; it is not a historical but a didactic treatise; it belongs to the period of the conflict between Gnosticism and Catholicism; it reflects the philosophical speculation of Philo and the Alexandrian school and the Christian Gnosticism they helped to foster, though with such modifications as made it a useful instrument for the development of the Catholic type of thought.

The first reference to this gospel as a work of John is found in an epistle written by Theophilus of Antioch ca. 180 A. D.; and the first distinct statement that its author was the apostle John is met in a work of Irenaeus, then bishop of Lyons, written about the same time. The Muratorian Canon at the end of the second century ascribes it to the apostle. Celsus may have consulted the gospel in 178 A. D. Tatian knew it. This is certain, aside from the question of the *Diatessaron*. The Arabic translation of a *Diatessaron* published by Ciasca has on insufficient grounds been supposed to be Tatian's. The Sinaitic Syriac, which contains the Fourth Gospel, may have been made toward the end of the second century. Fragments have been preserved of a commentary on this gospel by Heracleon, a disciple of Valentinus. Two other disciples of Valentinus, Ptolemy and Theodotus, were familiar with it. There is no evidence that Valentinus himself knew it; and the testimony of Hippolytus in his *Philosophoumena* (ca. 225 A. D.) to its use by Basilides is not trustworthy. Marcion, who came to Rome about 144 A. D., was not acquainted with it. Justin Martyr, who wrote his *Apolo-*

gies and *Dialogue with Trypho* between 152 and 160 A. D., does not mention it. Some of his statements, and especially his use of the Logos-speculation, have led to the belief that he may have read it, though he did not recognize its authority. It is more natural to suppose that he was influenced by the general trend of thought that found expression in the gospel. Neither Irenaeus nor Eusebius has preserved any statement from the lost work of Papias indicating that he knew this gospel. A Bodleyan manuscript quoting "John the Evangelist" seems to be ascribed to Papias. But this Papias is probably the lexicographer of the twelfth century. A manuscript in the Vatican contains an *argumentum* in which Papias is said to have acted as John's amanuensis and yet to have been a contemporary of Marcion. Though possibly older than Jerome, this *argumentum* has no historical value. Polycarp does not mention this gospel. No quotations from it are found in the epistles ascribed to Ignatius of Antioch, and probably written ca. 140 A. D., though similar ideas are here and there expressed. The Gnostic *Acts of John* ascribed to Leucius Charinus speak of John as "the beloved disciple." This work evidently comes from the same milieu as the gospel; but it is impossible to prove dependence on either side. The external evidence shows with increasing clearness, what was observed already a century ago, that this gospel was cherished among the Gnostics before it came into use among Catholic Christians.[1]

Since the end of the second century a tradition existed in the Church that the apostle John lived to a high old age in Ephesus and died there peaceably in the time of Trajan. It is significant that Papias evidently did not know the apostle John either as the writer of a gospel or as the head of the church in Ephesus. If he had, Irenaeus and Eusebius would have been only too glad to record it. Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, the Deutero-

[1] Before Bretschneider's *Probabilia*, 1820, Horst in Henke's *Magazin*, 1803, presented this fact with great clearness.

Pauline epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians, Marcion, and the Ignatian epistles are silent concerning any sojourn of the apostle John in Asia Minor. There was in fact a somewhat widespread tradition that the apostle John did not die naturally at Ephesus in the reign of Trajan, but was put to death by the Jews in Jerusalem long before that time. George the Sinner in the ninth century quotes a passage from the second book of Papias's work affirming that the apostle John was put to death by the Jews. Heracleon does not mention John among the apostles who had died a natural death. The ancient Syriac calendar commemorates on December 27 as martyrs "John and James the apostles in Jerusalem"; and the Armenian, Ethiopic, Gothico-Gallic and Carthaginian calendars similarly mention the two martyred brothers.[1] Matth. xx, 23, and Mark x, 39, imply that John was to be, or had been, baptized with the same baptism of blood as James. Whether this tradition rests upon a solid foundation of fact, and in that case the apostle was martyred at the same time as his brother or later, is not easy to determine. It appears at any rate to be older than that of his long sojourn in Ephesus and natural death there. Papias carefully distinguishes between John, the apostle, and John, the presbyter, the contemporary of Aristion. This presbyter John is also mentioned by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, ca. 190 A. D., in connection with Polycarp, Melito and their contemporaries. Legendary embellishments already cluster about his figure: he is a priest and wears the pontifical diadem. It is evident that this John, the presbyter, has been confused with John, the apostle. Such a merging of the presbyter into the apostle probably occurs in John xxi, 20 ff. John, the presbyter, is already dead; hence the necessity of correcting the mistaken idea that "the beloved disciple" had actually been promised to live until the return of Christ. The memory of his life far into the second century still lingers and sup-

[1] On these calendars see F. P. Badham, The Martyrdom of John the Apostle, in *The American Journal of Theology*, July, 1904, p. 539 ff.

plements in some circles the defective information as to the later fortunes and end of the life of John, the apostle. The champions of Peter's primacy, who by their addition to the gospel made it acceptable to the Catholic Church, were convinced that it came from the hand of "the beloved disciple," unable to distinguish between the two Johns, but anxious to prevent any rival claims by the Johannine school based on the widely reported saying of Jesus and the developing legend of John's continued existence on earth or translation. It is impossible to prove that this presbyter John who is known through Papias only as a transmitter of oral tradition had anything to do with the composition of the Fourth Gospel, is identical with "the presbyter" of the epistles whose name is not given, or is the author of the Apocalypse, or any part of it. The attempts to fasten upon him the authorship of the gospel are wholly unconvincing, in spite of the names of eminent scholars that may be cited in favor of this conjecture. The value of these efforts lies in the fact that they have revealed one of the prime factors in the growth of tradition. The ancient Alogi and some modern scholars, notably Fries, ascribed the whole gospel, or a considerable part of it, to Cerinthus. This opinion has no more intrinsic probability, but shows a correct appreciation of its Gnostic character. The same judgment applies to the view of Kreyenbühl who regards Menander of Kapparetaea, the alleged disciple of Simon Magus and probable teacher of Valentinus and Basilides, as the author. A careful criticism must be satisfied with a *non liquet* on the question of authorship.

When the late, vacillating and unreliable tradition of apostolic authorship is set aside, and the Fourth Gospel is compared, without prejudice, with the Synoptics, it becomes possible to understand its character. It is in no sense a historical account of what Jesus said and did. It is significant that even conservative scholars find it impossible to maintain that the speeches it puts upon the lips of Jesus were actually uttered by him, at least in

the form given to them, or to deny that there are irreconcilable conflicts between the historic framework and the Synoptic representation. Sanday freely admits "in this collection of sayings an element—possibly a somewhat considerable element—that represents not so much what was actually spoken as enlargement and comment embodying the experience and reflection of the growing church."[1] Any serious attempt, however, to separate such enlargements and comments from the supposed genuine nucleus only tends to reveal the substantial unity of the whole structure. Some expansions there no doubt were. But the theories of Schweizer, of Harnack and Bousset, of Delff and Fries, by which it has been sought to vindicate a genuine kernel reported by the presbyter John during the visits of Jesus to Jerusalem, have failed to commend themselves chiefly for two reasons. However small the remnant, it still exhibits the same Johannine characteristics, the same peculiar philosophical style, the same contrast to the language ascribed to Jesus in the Synoptics, the same fundamental difference from the other gospels in the conception of his career. In some respects, the source-theory of Weisse, Freytag and Wendt is more plausible. There is no reason to doubt that the author may have had before him other sources than the Synoptics. It is not inconceivable that this work was preceded by another of a similar character coming from the same Hellenistic *milieu*, very much as the Chronicles were preceded by a similar Midrash on the Book of Kings. But there is no indication of this; and the value of the discovery of any additional sources used by the evangelist is at once greatly reduced by observing the manner in which he deals with the sources known to us that he obviously had at his disposal.

The freedom with which the author uses his material is explained in part by his philosophy, in part by his allegorical method, and in part by his Christian experience. The

[1] Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. IV, 1902, p. 575.

Prologue clearly indicates his philosophical position. He was a disciple of Philo and a Christian Gnostic. Whether he had ever read the works of Philo or not, it was from them that he derived his great organizing idea. The more intimately one becomes acquainted with Philo's thought, the more inevitable becomes the conclusion that its salient features must have been known to the Fourth Evangelist, and the more probable it seems, from the repetition of numerous phrases, that the later writer was actually familiar with the works of his predecessor. It is equally clear that he was a Gnostic. His gospel was designed to present Jesus as an incarnate god; a manifestation of the divine Logos in a human personality; a dispenser to the sons of light of that hidden knowledge, or *gnosis,* which gives them eternal life; an emanation from the Supreme God going forth into the darkness of the Cosmos and returning to him, that another emanation, the Paraclete, may take his place. Of his two cardinal ideas "the Logos was God" and "the Logos became flesh," Philo supplied the former. The idea of a divine incarnation, still foreign to Philo's speculation, ultimately came from India. Through Persia the belief in *avatars,* or divine incarnations, together with the hope of redemption through esoteric knowledge and the conception of an absolute ethical dualism, came to Syria, Egypt and Asia Minor. Gnosticism—Pagan, Jewish and Christian—was the result.[1] The Gnostic philosophy of emanation through the Fourth Gospel became regnant in the Christian Church. The author successfully strove to commend to the Church the Gnosticism in which he believed, carefully removing those features of which he could not approve by emphasizing, against docetic tendencies, the reality of the incarnation, the true humanity assumed by the Logos.

The allegorical method permitted him to read his own philosophy into the records he had before him, to ignore

[1] See *Excursus A.*

as of little importance, or to lose sight of, literal sense and historic fact, to seek for the spirit which "bloweth where it listeth," and to symbolize its message in new and suggestive forms. Thus the difficulties in the Old Testament so keenly felt by Gnostics yielded to a new species of Gnostic thought. The creation of the world is understood as an eternal procession of things through the Logos. The prophetic inspiration in Israel is not thought of as the action of a deity dealing in such a manner only with the Jews, but as the illumination offering itself impartially to every soul that comes into the world. The supreme sacrifice, the paschal lamb, is but a type of the true Lamb of God. The sacred feasts of the Passover, the Tabernacles, the Dedication are but symbols whose real meaning becomes apparent, when the Logos offers his flesh for food, his spirit for drink, his body for a temple. The Sabbath itself is a sign, not of rest, but of work, the marvelous and everlasting work of God and of the Logos.

It is not strange that an author who thus treats the great ideas and institutions of the Old Testament should reveal the same spirit in dealing with the earlier gospels. They were seen in the light of the Word made flesh. There is no story of a conception by the Holy Ghost and a virgin birth in this gospel. The Logos exists from eternity to eternity. When he appears in the flesh, he has a father as well as a mother. But these earthly relations have no significance; the spiritual relations alone are important. Jesus is not baptized by John. He is publicly recognized as the Messiah by the Baptist, and carries on his work independently of his predecessor before the arrest of the latter. There is no Messianic temptation. The Logos cannot be tempted with evil. There is no concealment of his Messiahship, no injunction upon his disciples not to proclaim him as the Messiah. The Logos does not preach the coming of the kingdom of heaven; he points incessantly to himself. There is no transfiguration; the cross is his mount of transfiguration. There is no conflict with devils for the healing of men, and no confession of

him as the Messiah by demons or demoniacs. The Logos cannot come into contact with this world of unclean spirits. The miracles of this gospel seem to be intended as allegories. They are exaggerated to such a point as to raise at least the question whether they were at all meant to be taken as narratives of actual occurrences. In place of the formalism of the Jews, with their purificatory rites, Jesus pours out his precious, joy-giving wine. The bread he multiplies is the heavenly manna, himself. He restores the sight of men that they may see the invisible glory of the Son of God. Jesus eats no paschal meal. He is himself the paschal lamb. Hence his death is placed, contrary to the Synoptics, on the fourteenth of Nisan when the paschal lamb was slain. There is no institution of the Lord's Supper. The author knows the eucharistic formulas; but he maintains that "the flesh profiteth nothing"; it is the teaching of Jesus that is spirit and life. In the place of the eucharist he puts the foot-washing. There is no agony in Gethsemane. There is no cry of God-forsakenness on the cross. The Logos walks in calm unruffled majesty to his glorification. There is no ascension after forty days. The Logos breathes upon the disciples and the Paraclete is sent to them. If some of the material, such as the conversations with Nicodemus and the Samaritan woman, the message of Philip and the placing of John and Mary beneath the cross, was derived from other gospels unknown to us, it has evidently gone through the same transformation. The author's allegorizing tendency is particularly manifest in the story of the Samaritan woman who clearly represents the Samaritan people that has abandoned its five Assyrian gods, but not attained to the temple-less worship of God in spirit and in truth.

But neither the influence of Alexandrian and Oriental speculation nor the use of allegorical methods of interpretation can fully account for the nature of this most remarkable literary production left to us by Christian antiquity. The Logos here presented is no mere philo-

sophical abstraction. By being welded to the historical personality of Jesus of Nazareth, it has become instinct with life, informed with his spirit, a divinely human object of faith, love and devotion. The Christ of Paul is a celestial being, the ideal, archetypal man, the Son of God by virtue of his resurrection. To have known him according to the flesh, to be acquainted with his words and deeds, is of no importance, to live in spiritual communion with the risen and glorified Lord is all-important. The Logos of the Fourth Gospel walks on earth, tabernacles in the flesh, sends forth unceasingly the rays of his divine glory through the veil of his assumed humanity, and it is here, in his incarnate existence, that the believer finds him and lives with him. This Christian experience is genuine and sincere; it fills the author's soul with life and light and joy. Its power does not depend upon the objective reality of such a personal Logos, nor upon the historical character of such an incarnation of a god. Its source is not the Philonian Logos, but the human life of Jesus. With all its grandeur, this incarnate god is not so great as the humble teacher of Nazareth. Out of his fulness the Evangelist received, "and grace for grace." To have come under the influence of his spirit is Christian experience. To this experience is due what is permanent in the thought of the Fourth Gospel. Time, like an ever rolling stream, sweeps away what is perishable in the grandest structures of human speculation. But it preserves and enhances the value of the things that have in them abiding substance. While the Johannine conception of the Christ fades away before the glory of the historic reality shining through the Synoptic representation, the spiritual freedom and insight of the great evangelist become all the more apparent. These were largely hidden as long as men sought in his gospel what it could not give, more accurate information concerning the words and deeds of Jesus; they stand out in startling relief when seen against the background of the crystallizing traditions and fixed institutions of the Church in the fourth decade

of the second century. Had the Church possessed a tithe of the spirit of him who substituted a foot-washing for the eucharist, suppressed the baptism of Jesus, refused to be bound by gospel-books and ecclesiastical tradition, found life and redemption in the essence and trend of Jesus' teaching and not in forensic fictions, understood that "the letter killeth" and let his present ideal speak in ways that seemed to him true, stagnation of doctrinal development, a rigid fixity of institutional character, and a deadening imposition of external authority on the consciences of men would have been impossible. The internal evidence apparently indicates that the gospel was written between 135 and 140 A. D., while the reprisals taken by the Jews for their sufferings in consequence of the insurrection under Simon bar Kozeba were fresh in mind, and it is possible that John v, 35, contains an allusion to this Messiah.

The Gospels according to Matthew, Mark and Luke were called by Griesbach "Synoptics," and the term has been kept for the sake of convenience, though it is apparent, on close examination, that they are by no means written from the same point of view. The differences are as important a part of the Synoptic problem as the similarities. The reader who turns from a perusal of Matthew to Mark, and then to Luke, finds himself going over familiar ground. In Mark there is nothing that is absolutely new; in Luke there are sections that contain new material. But on the whole the story appears to be the same. Yet the thoughtful and observing student is puzzled to find that very rarely the same saying has been given in the same form or put in the same connection, and that the differences in the historic setting are often very marked. He is constantly forced to ask himself, Did Jesus actually utter the words that Matthew places on his lips, or those ascribed to him by Mark, or the quite different ones reported by Luke? Which is the more original, and to what accidents or conscious motives are the changes due? Has the silence of one or two of the

evangelists in regard to an important utterance any significance? If the authors transformed old sayings, is it also likely that they created new ones? To what extent are changes due to errors and additions in transmission rather than to the evangelists themselves? Can they be explained as occasioned by differences in rendering a common Aramaic original, or were there different Aramaic sources? Was any of our present Greek gospels directly translated from an Aramaic gospel, or does the process of individual rendering of Aramaic sayings into Greek lie further behind the process of gospel-writing in Greek? Has any Greek gospel come down to us in its original form, or have they all suffered to some extent by addition and excision, alteration and transposition? Does any gospel show literary dependence on any other? Have we any knowledge of literary sources used by the evangelists? What value should be ascribed to oral tradition? What is likely to be the date of the present gospels, of these gospels in their most original form, and of their sources? And what degree of credibility can be assigned to these records of the life and teaching of Jesus?

Thus one question leads to another. In attempting to answer them we naturally turn first to the earliest ascertainable tradition of the church. The only really important testimony as to Matthew and Mark is found in some fragments of a lost work of Papias, bishop of Hierapolis, in Phrygia, toward the middle of the second century. These fragments have been preserved by Eusebius.[1] Papias declares that the apostle Matthew wrote certain Logia, or sayings of Jesus, in "the Hebrew dialect" and that each man interpreted them in his own way. He adds that it was his constant endeavor to secure information concerning the words of Jesus from the disciples of the presbyters who had themselves been the disciples of the apostles. By the "Hebrew dialect" he no doubt means the Aramaic spoken by the Hebrews of the period. If he had himself been able to consult the Aramaic work, he

[1] *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 39, 1 ff.

would unquestionably have mentioned so important a fact. His assertion that each man interpreted the Aramaic in his own way shows that he was familiar with various Greek gospels claiming to be translations of the apostolic work. He ascribed none of these to the apostle Matthew. Not having in his possession any gospel on which he felt he could implicitly rely, he leaned all the more heavily on oral tradition. He was glad to take such tradition from the third generation. He was acquainted with the Gospel according to Mark, and regarded this as haivng been written by a companion of Peter, under his influence. Concerning Luke and John he knew nothing.

It is evident that a tradition that appears for the first time a hundred years after the death of Jesus, and has been preserved to us only in late excerpts of a work written about that time, does not carry as much weight as one might wish. It may simply record the prevalent view in Asia Minor at the time of Antoninus Pius (138-161 A. D.). This view may have some foundation in fact; but we are unable to prove its accuracy. Aside from the doubtful identity of the Gospel according to the Hebrews known to Jerome and others, it is altogether probable that there existed in Syria an Aramaic gospel. The investigations in regard to the term "son of man" have convinced the present writer that the so-called *Jerusalem Lectionary*, whatever the date of its present form, has been influenced by an earlier Aramaic gospel.[1] The Aramaic speaking Christians of Syria must have had a gospel of their own. Their peculiar doctrinal position demanded it. As their peculiarities affected the life and ministry of Jesus quite as much as his teaching, it is *a priori* probable that this gospel was not merely a collection of sayings. There is also every reason to believe that it was ascribed to Matthew. Papias had evidently heard that such a gospel existed. His word can of course not prove that it actually was written by the apostle. The question has been much discussed whether the term he uses shows

[1] Cf. *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Vol. IV, 1903, cols. 4714, 4727.

that it was only a collection of detached utterances or a gospel giving a narrative of the life of Jesus as well. The analogy of Old Testament usage renders the latter alternative more probable. We have no collection of prophetic oracles in the Old Testament that is not supplied with editorial superscriptions, and accounts of events connected with the lives of the prophets are frequently interspersed in the books of the second canon. It is also significant that, in spite of this narrative material, the books are given such titles as *The Words of Amos, The Words of Jeremiah* and the like. An Aramaic work bearing the title *The Words of Jesus* may very well have combined both appropriate headings and brief narratives. As the *Sayings of Jesus* found in Egypt clearly do not go back to any Aramaic original, these extracts from some current gospel have no bearing on the question.

It would be hazardous to affirm that the work of whose existence Papias was aware originally came from the hand of Matthew. As this apostle was said to have been a publican, tradition may have seized upon him as the most likely to have been the author. If the book was called *The Words of Jesus,* it is likely to have been at first anonymous, and the analogy of Hebrew usage may be instructive also on this point. The disciples of famous rabbis would, first of all, seek to preserve in memory and to transmit by word of mouth the utterances of their teachers. As aids to memory, however, they would permit themselves the use of memoranda. To this method we owe, in a large measure, the enormous Talmudic collections. It is not impossible that some disciples of Jesus in old age wrote down in his vernacular such words and incidents as he remembered. The remarkable preservation of an earlier strand of tradition out of harmony with the prevailing view of Jesus in a later age may be cited in favor of this theory. Even more probability attaches to another theory also based on Hebrew customs. The transmission of the decisions of a rabbi in the name of one of his disciples is exceedingly common in the Tal-

mud. Similarly, a Christian belonging to the second generation may have given the words of Jesus on the authority of Matthew, and not relying on his memory, as the immediate disciple might, he may have written down many a saying and provided it with its historic setting. The Aramaic gospel may in this sense have been from its inception a gospel "according to Matthew." It no doubt grew by gradual expansion, but unfortunately we have no means of determining its extent at the time when it was first translated into Greek.

What is the relation of our Greek Matthew to the original Aramaic gospel? Papias singles out no version as more authoritative than any other, and evidently distrusts them all. If it really was one of the translations with which he was familiar that won recognition as the Gospel according to Matthew, it is likely to have gained this distinction above the others later than his time. When the present text of Matthew is critically examined, it is readily perceived that it cannot be a translation of an Aramaic original. The fact that, at least in the vast majority of instances, the quotations from the Old Testament are taken from the Greek version is alone decisive against such an assumption.[1] But while the present text cannot have been a rendering of a Semitic original, its most remote ancestor in the second century may. There are numerous indications that the First Gospel has undergone various changes—some of them of a most momentous character—before the end of the fourth century. Conybeare[2] has shown that before the Council of Nicaea in 325

[1] Even in regard to those quotations which do not quite correspond to the ordinary tests of the so-called Septuagint Version, it is very probable that they came from a Greek version. If the differences are not merely due to earlier variants supplanted in the leading majuscules by others, they may represent another Greek version or text-recension, of which there is considerable evidence. The supposition that any editor of the gospel used the Hebrew text is less likely than that the Greek texts consulted by those to whom we owe the gospel exhibited certain differences.

[2] *Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* 1903.

A. D. Eusebius again and again quoted the Great Commission in Matthew xxviii, 19, as follows: "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations in my name," and he has rendered it probable that the ultimately prevailing form, including the commandment to baptize and the trinitarian formula, represents an expansion made in some locality and gradually finding its way to the different parts of the Church. But even the unexpanded form is clearly a later addition. Most critics recognize that the conferring of the primacy on Peter in Matthew xvi, 18, 19, is a similar expansion of the text in the interest of the growing Roman hierarchy. But Matth. xvi, 17, is no doubt also a later addition. It was seen already in the Early Church and again by Baptist scholars in the sixteenth century and modern exegetes that the first two chapters of the gospel had been subsequently placed before the beginning of the original text. Some earlier exordium was probably displaced, as the first verse of the third chapter indicates. When it is observed that the majority of Old Testament quotations are found in these chapters, the suggestion naturally offers itself that the hand which wrote the story of the birth and infancy also introduced in the rest of the gospel references to the fulfilment of Old Testament prophecies. As the opening chapters themselves have manifestly undergone at least one redaction, seeing that the author of Joseph's pedigree cannot have written the narrative of the virgin birth, it is also possible that some of these often loosely attached observations on the fulfilment of prophecy are due to a later editor.

But even when these palpable additions are removed, it is quite inconceivable that the remainder can be the work of the same author. That the writer who chose to record the attacks of Jesus upon fundamental principles of the Mosaic law should have neutralized the effect of these criticisms by introducing statements censuring the least deviation from the letter of the Law, such as are found in Matth. vi, 17-19, can no more be comprehended

than that Jesus himself should have uttered the self-condemnatory words. This is but one example among many showing that the original gospel has suffered interpolations. These accretions are so different in character that it is difficult to understand them as the result of systematic redaction. Hilgenfeld[1] recognized these facts more clearly than any other scholar. Whether he was correct in explaining them by subsequent editorial processes in different schools, is more doubtful. The First Gospel seems to have been more widely used than any of the others owing to its age and assumed apostolic authority. It is therefore natural that it should have received more marginal glosses, emendations, interpolated sections, and doctrinal enlargements. It is a common occurrence that an ancient, greatly cherished, and frequently copied manuscript thus gathers about it more material foreign to the original text than later and inferior codices.[2] If this process is duly considered, it is easy to believe that the Greek Matthew in its earliest form may have been a translation of an Aramaic gospel, and there is nothing to prevent the assumption that it was one of several renderings of the gospel ascribed to Matthew, having certain peculiarities that made its claim to accuracy appear most plausible.

Such considerations also give added credibility to the uniform tradition of the Early Church that the Gospel according to Matthew is the oldest of the Synoptics. Against this tradition and in favor of the priority of Mark it has been urged, that the latter is shorter than the others, that practically all that it contains is also found in the others, and that the historic development of Jesus' career comes out more clearly in it than in the others. But it is quite impossible to determine whether Matthew in its earl-

[1] See especially his *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1875, and his *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, passim.

[2] An interesting illustration of this may be seen in Codex Venetus of Ecclesiasticus; see Schmidt, *The Book of Ecclesiasticus*, 1903, p. xxiii ff.

iest Greek form was more extensive than Mark. As Mark clearly adressed himself to a different class of readers and had a different purpose, he may have made a selection. The assumption that he comprehended the growth of Jesus' Messianic consciousness and the gradual unfolding of his Messianic programme better than the other evangelists is not well founded. It is supposed that he alone understood the importance of the episode at Caesarea Philippi, and realized that this was the turning-point in the career of Jesus, the time when he first revealed the secret of his Messiahship. But Mark, who clearly uses the term "Son of Man" as a Messianic title, puts this as a self-designation on the lips of Jesus before the visit to Caesarea Philippi. Concerning the real nature of this term he shows no more knowledge than Matthew, and the true significance of Jesus' question to his disciples appears to have been as little recognized by him as by Matthew. The early tradition that Jesus never assumed for himself any unmistakable Messianic title and actually forbade his disciples to say that he was the Messiah, facts which in the light of the conviction of his disciples that he was the Messiah were naturally interpreted as signifying that during his life-time he had wished his official character to be unknown, is better preserved in Matthew than in Mark. For the former[1] allows Jesus to preserve his Messianic incognito to the end, even in the presence of the high-priest, while the latter,[2] contrary to both Matthew and Luke, makes Jesus distinctly affirm to an outsider his Messiahship.

Papias connected the Second Gospel directly with Mark, and indirectly with Peter. The latter must be regarded as an after-thought. There is every reason to believe that the gospel was written in Rome. We have no trustworthy historic evidence that Peter was ever in Rome. But as

[1] *Matth.*, xxvi, 64, "Thou sayest" (not I); similarly, *Luke* xxii, 70: "Ye say that I am." Cf. Merx, *Das Evangelium Matthäus*, 1902, p. 391 ff.

[2] *Mark*, xiv, 62, "I am."

the tradition developed that he had been the first bishop of Rome, the desire would naturally be felt to give his authority to the gospel recognized in that church. An earlier tradition that it was written by Mark could not be set aside; but it was possible to bring the author into connection with Peter. Who the Mark was on whose authority it was presented, we do not know. There is no tradition to the effect that it was originally written in Aramaic, and it does not have the appearance of being a translation. The emphasis given to the thaumaturgical powers of Jesus, his successful exorcisms, and his relations to the world of demons who know the secret of his Messiahship, is precisely what might be expected in a Hellenistic Jew writing with the view to convincing Romans of his supernatural greatness and authority. That the writer was familiar with the Greek Matthew, is altogether probable. He adds no important new material. But his variations show that he exercised the same liberty, and consulted the form of oral tradition prevalent in his circle in the same manner, as all other early Christian writers with whom we are familiar. There is nowhere any leaning upon an absolutely authoritative source. As a writer Mark distinguishes himself favorably by his conciseness of statement, his vivid style, and his local coloring. His gospel has remained comparatively free from later additions. No one added to it a gospel of the infancy, as in the case of the other Synoptics. The original ending seems to be lost. A substitute found its way into many copies. Aristion has been supposed to be its author, but on insufficient grounds.[1] Another shorter substitute has also been preserved, which is of still later origin.

The Third Gospel apparently at one time circulated without the name of Luke. Marcion was familiar with a gospel exhibiting so marked a similarity to the Gospel according to Luke that there is scarcely room for doubt

[1] See P. Rohrbach, *Der Schluss des Marcus Evangeliums*, 1894; Conybeare, *Expositor*, 1893, p. 241 ff.

as to its substantial identity. But it does not seem to have had the name of Luke attached to it, and it showed some important deviations from the present form. The first two chapters were lacking, and here and there different readings were found. It is possible that the gospel had already suffered somewhat through the bias of Ebionitish and Gnostic copyists, as it certainly has suffered since through the prepossessions of Catholic scribes. Whether Marcion's gospel contained the Preface i, 1-4, is uncertain, but cannot be said to be improbable. It does not mention the name of the writer, and gives no clue to the authorship to anyone who has no independent knowledge of who the friend of Theophilus was. Such knowledge we do not possess, and it may be questioned whether Marcion did. There is no reason to doubt the identity of the author of the gospel with the compiler of Acts. As one of the sources used by the latter may have been written by Luke, the companion of Paul, it is easy to account for the tradition that makes him the author of both works. There is no claim to Lukan authorship in the preface to either, and the internal evidence is strongly against the assumption that the author of the We-Source had anything to do with the composition of the larger works. From the preface we gain the same impression as from the fragments of Papias. The author is acquainted with numerous gospels, is displeased with their lack of order and incompleteness, distrusts their accuracy, and draws upon the living streams of tradition. Among the gospels that he had at his disposal, Matthew, Mark and an otherwise unknown work largely used in the section, ix, 51-xviii, 14, seem to have been the most important. That he wrote later than Matthew and Mark is to-day generally acknowledged by critics; that he knew his predecessors and derived the bulk of his information from them is the most natural conclusion, though it has been questioned by some. It appears to the present writer a serious mistake to begin the comparison of Matthew and Luke with the first two chapters of each, and to allow the result to influ-

ence the final decision. Both of these gospels of the infancy are later additions and themselves of highly composite character. Luke i, 5-ii, 52, iii, 23-38, forms a section made up of extracts from a Book of Zechariah; a Jewish Psalm, wrongly ascribed first to Elizabeth, and then in the majority of manuscripts to Mary; a story of the birth of Jesus as the son of Joseph and Mary, subsequently re-touched by an editor believing in the virgin-birth; and a genealogy intended to prove that the father of Jesus was a descendant of David. Even if it were easier than it is to determine the relation of the various elements entering into this composition to the gospel of the infancy in Matthew, little light would be thrown by it on the relative age of the gospels of the ministry of Jesus to which they have been prefixed.

As we do not know either the general character or the age of the source upon which the author has drawn for the material not found in the other Synoptics, no inference is possible as to his own age and attitude toward Matthew and Mark from his use of it. Nor does the peculiar form in which he quotes the Synoptic apocalypse allow any conclusion in reference to its wording in the text that lies behind all the three evangelists. The attempts to solve these problems by the so-called "Two-Source Theory" cannot be regarded as successful. According to this theory, in its most popular and plausible form, the authors of Matthew and Luke had before them the Gospel of Mark, and all three made use of a collection of Sayings of Jesus written in Greek and now lost. The more closely the Gospel of Mark is compared with what may be regarded as the most original form of Matthew both as respects the utterances of Jesus and the general character of his ministry, the more difficult it is to maintain the priority of Mark. While there is no *a priori* objection to supposing that among the early Christian works that have been lost there once was such a *Logia Jesu* as many modern scholars resort to for the explanation of the Synoptic problem, the hypothesis seems unnecessary, has no foun-

dation in early tradition, and is only productive of new difficulties. If Mark only occasionally used this source, deriving his information in the main from some living authority or some other gospel, why should he have copied the few sayings so differently from Matthew and Luke, and why should he have passed by so much genuine and valuable material in a book he deemed worthy of use? If Matthew was anxious, as he apparently was, to communicate all that Jesus said, why should he have deliberately left out such precious parables as those of the Lost Coin, the Lost Sheep, the Lost Son, the Good Samaritan, the Pharisee and the Publican and the Rich Man and Lazarus? If Luke drew most extensively from this source, how are the similar omissions in his gospel and the apparent looseness of quotation in numerous places to be accounted for? Is it to be supposed that Mark failed to appreciate the beauty of the Lord's Prayer, and that neither Matthew nor Mark was moved by the pathos of the Prodigal Son? If such a book existed coming with the authority of an apostle and commending itself to the evangelists so highly that they actually copied from it the words of Jesus, is it likely that the result should have been the numerous variants in the simplest sayings and the peculiar selection of material? It is difficult to avoid the impression that forces have been at work in the production of our gospels that would have been checked, if the method had been that of simply copying a common, authoritative document.

The individual freedom that under all circumstances must be granted, and the peculiar relations of the three writers, seem to find their most natural explanation, if it is supposed, in harmony with the earliest tradition, that the First Evangelist translated his work from an Aramaic original ascribed to Matthew, that the Second Evangelist looked upon this Greek gospel as one of many more or less doubtful attempts to render the original text, adopted its general outline and drew upon it largely but also leaned on the tradition of his church, and that the Third

Evangelist used his two predecessors, without assigning to them any higher authority than that of at least one other gospel which he used, but also endeavored to find through oral sources what the truth was, and quoted the sayings of Jesus in the form familiar to him from the usage of his church or province. The first translations of the words of Jesus were no doubt made in a manner similar to the first translations of the Hebrew Scriptures among Hellenistic Jews. They were Targums. To supplement the imperfect knowledge of the sacred language a *methurgeman* rendered into the vernacular section by section the text read. Thus the extant Aramaic Targums and the earlier Greek versions came into existence. How much freedom the interpreter might use depended on his own judgment and the importance of what he explained. We are only too well acquainted with the liberties taken by some, while we admire the accuracy and skill of others. In the case of the Old Testament we are fortunate enough to have, if not the original text, at least one of its direct descendants speaking its own language. The Aramaic gospel is lost, and not a single saying of Jesus has come down to us in his own vernacular through any channel. The Greek gospels themselves have undergone so many changes that we are in a far worse plight than those who could examine the first drafts of these documents.

In attempting to fix the dates of the Synoptic gospels, it is of the utmost importance to bear in mind what may be ascertained concerning the composition of these works. When so careful a critic as Pfleiderer[1] allows himself to be influenced by some of the most obvious interpolations in Matthew to date the entire gospel in ca. 140 A. D., a *caveat* is necessary. What would be thought of an Old Testament critic who would place the whole Book of Amos in the Babylonian Exile, or the entire Books of Isaiah and Jeremiah in the Maccabaean age because of the sections that unmistakably come from these late periods? Students of the Old Testament have learnt to distinguish

[1] *Das Urchristentum*[2], 1902.

between the age of a book in substantially its present form and the age of its various component parts. Some parts of our Matthew may be later than Pfleiderer's date for the book. The value of determining when even the smallest and youngest section was written should not be underestimated. But the main interest is to discover, if possible, the date of the earliest part. When was the first draft made of the Greek Matthew? Three facts may throw some light on this question. Eusebius[1] records that in the reign of Trajan (98-117 A. D.) "many disciples, full of zeal for the divine word, followed the old exhortation of the Saviour, distributed their goods to the poor, left their country and became evangelists, holding it to be an honor to preach the doctrine of the faith to those to whom it was unknown, and to place in their hands the written text of the divine gospels." This is evidently the reflection of a historic fact. The presentation in Greek of the Aramaic gospel ascribed to Matthew was coincident with the break of the Jewish Christian Church in Palestine with Judaism and the consequent devotion of many of its members to a missionary propaganda among the Gentiles. The appearance of other gospels in Greek, whether as translations of the Aramaic gospel, or as independent accounts soon after the first, made the epoch memorable; and it is by no means improbable that the first interpreters were at the same time exhorters, evangelists in every sense of the word. If the tradition, naturally somewhat misunderstood by Eusebius, is well founded, it may signify that Matthew, Mark and Luke in their earliest Greek form appeared in the beginning of the second century.

Another fact points in the same direction. The Synoptic apocalypse manifestly comes from a Semitic original, but the differences between the three versions are not such as can be explained by peculiarities of translation. That it has gone from Matthew to Mark, and from both to

[1] *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 37, 2.

Luke, is seen on careful examination. Matthew has preserved the expectation of the coming of the Messiah immediately after the distress of the siege of Jerusalem,[1] the anxiety lest the flight be on the sabbath, and the emphasis on the conflict with heathen nations. Mark can no longer write "immediately after the distress of those days," eliminates the reference to the sabbath, and introduces persecutions in synagogues, and before governors and kings. Luke follows his example, but goes beyond him by placing "the times of the Gentiles" when they shall trample Jerusalem under foot between the destruction of the city and the advent of the Messiah. Wellhausen has convincingly shown that the Aramaic apocalypse originated in the days of the siege of Jerusalem, and he is probably right in regarding it as a non-Christian product. Whether it was appropriated to Christian use and placed on the lips of Jesus already by the author of the Aramaic gospel, or circulated independently in a Greek translation and was subsequently incorporated in the Greek Matthew, is a delicate question to answer. In favor of the latter alternative it may be said that the Son of Man as a Messianic title, not found as yet in the apocalypses of the reign of Domitian (81-96 A. D.), Baruch, Ezra, the original Parables of Enoch, and John, seems to have appeared for the first time in Christian writings in the Greek translation of this apocalypse, and that the Gnostic influence of the conception of a Celestial Son of the Macrocosmic Man, ultimately of Indian origin, which at any rate facilitated the introduction of the in-

[1] It is faithfulness to the text before him, and not nearness to the catastrophe, that is the cause of this preservation of the original form, though it may be questioned whether Matthew understood the quoted apocalypse to affirm the coming of the Messiah within a month, or a year, or a generation. Matthew realized that concerning the exact time no man and not even the angels of the heavens, but only the Father, had any knowledge. "Not even the Son" is an addition probably made in the second half of the second century, not found in our earliest witnesses to the text. There is probably an interpolation also in Mark, though the testimony is less conclusive.

felicitous rendering of the Aramaic *bar-nasha,* cannot so easily be understood in the case of the translator of the whole gospel, who nowhere else shows any sign of similar tendencies. Yet this apocalypse must have been interpolated at an early time, as it found its way through Matthew into Mark and Luke. A date subsequent to the reign of Domitian is probable.

A third indication of the same period is the use of the book entitled *The Wisdom of God* by Matthew and Luke. Its name is given only by Luke,[1] but it seems to have been already quoted by Matthew.[2] A generation must be supposed to have elapsed before a reference to the murder of Zechariah, the son of Barachiah, during the siege of Jerusalem can have been placed on the lips of Jesus. The *Wisdom of God* evidently lay before these authors (or at least before Luke, if the passage in Matthew is an interpolation) in a Greek text. Even if no other part of this work were known to us than the words immediately quoted, this quotation alone would show that the writer, or writers, who used it belonged to a time far subsequent to the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. It is not improbable, however, that the Synoptic apocalypse once was incorporated in it, and together with its other parts translated into Greek under the title *The Wisdom of God.* But the argument from the character of each section as to the late date of the gospels would in no wise be invalidated, if they should prove to have been at all times two independent works. That the Greek texts of Matthew, Mark and Luke, in their most primitive form, are not likely to have been written before the reign of Trajan, seems to be the inevitable conclusion from all the facts observed. So far as Luke is concerned his acquaintance with the *Antiquities* of Josephus remains a fact, even when the story of the infancy is ascribed to later hands, and clearly indicates that he wrote in the second century.

If none of the gospels, then, that we can consult were

[1] XI, 49.
[2] XXIII, 34 ff.

written by apostles or eye-witnesses, or existed at all before some sixty years or more had passed since the death of Jesus, to what extent can such accounts be regarded as trustworthy? Is it possible to lay down a line of evidence by which a nucleus of historic facts can be rendered probable? Can the historic figure be at all discerned through the veil of myth and legend? Can the words he actually uttered be gathered from these late translations, suffering from a host of accidental or intentional changes, weighed down with layer after layer of corrections, comments and interpolations? Is it possible to prove even the historic existence of the teacher of Nazareth? Such questions are not asked only by blind unbelief, determined incredulity, antipathy to the character portrayed, and a perverse moral attitude, preferring permanent doubt to an unwelcome truth; but also, and most insistently, by legitimate historic investigation, eager for the truth, patient in the search for it, grateful for every discovery, willing to hold or to abandon a position as the facts seem to demand, ready to doubt in order that faith may rest on tested foundations, rejoicing in the advance of knowledge, capable of appreciation, and sympathetic with the great facts and factors in the religious history of man.

The present writer has considered every such question that has occurred to his mind. The more radical and far-reaching they have been, the more urgent and important they seemed to him. So far as he is aware, the results were never dictated by his desire, or shaped by his prepossession. If an honest dealing with the facts should have seemed to lead to a negative answer to all these inquiries, he trusts that he would have had the moral fortitude to abide by his convictions, the confidence that somehow the truth is worth more than anything wrongly believed to be the truth, and the good sense to continue his questioning. It should be freely admitted, however, that it was with a deep satisfaction the author found himself borne along by the force of what seemed to him incontrovertible facts

to the conviction that Jesus of Nazareth actually existed, that some of the events of his life may be known to us, that some of his words may be recovered, and that his personality, imperfectly as we know it, and widely as it differed from the estimate of the church, is as sublime and potent for good as ever.

When the First Gospel is read in the light of an intelligent criticism, the internal evidence coincides with the earliest external testimony that brings it into connection with an Aramaic work ascribed to Matthew. It is manifest that the words here recorded were, to a large extent at least, uttered originally, not in Greek, not even such Greek as Hellenistic Jews spoke, but in Aramaic. If none of them were spoken by Jesus, or even if the reputed speaker never existed, they must have come from the lips of some teacher, or teachers, using the Aramaic language. Under no circumstances, therefore, can these sayings be the invention of our Greek evangelists. When they are translated back into the Galilean dialect of the Aramaic, as to some extent it is possible to do, they reveal an even more remarkable originality than in the Greek. If already the Greek text, or any modern version, impresses the thoughtful reader with the extraordinary power and beauty of these pithy sayings, parables and addresses, the effect is enhanced when the words are considered in his own vernacular. But to this general impression is often added the startling consciousness that behind some familiar saying there lies a new and strikingly original utterance, not dreamed of by the interpreters of the Greek text. In some cases that have already been considered, in which the term "son of man" occurred, the new sayings are not only original, and in a high degree suggestive of independent and radical thought, but also, naturally interpreted, in marked contrast with the order of ideas likely to have been entertained by the Aramaic speaking apostolate or propagators of the Messianic sentiment. Some explanation of this remarkable phenomenon must be found, and the most obvious is that the new

treasures come from the same mind that gave to the world the parables whose beauty no version could hide. These sayings possess evidential value just in proportion as they contradict the notions current in the circles through which they were transmitted. Believers in the Messiahship of Jesus cannot have invented for him speeches in which extraordinary powers are ascribed to man in general, while no prerogatives are reserved for the Messiah. If this process of translation into the Aramaic sometimes reveals to us such practically new sayings, too simple and yet profound to be the accidental groupings of words in a play of chance, and intelligible only as the products of a great and independent mind, it often shows the secondary character of passages that bear the marks of original composition in Greek, and cannot readily be turned into the Semitic dialect. It should not be necessary to insist that the first duty of the exegete is to test every reported utterance of Jesus in its probable Aramaic form, and that he who is incompetent to do this or neglects it must leave to others the most vital question concerning the life and teaching of Jesus.

On the other hand, the critical study of the Greek texts is as necessary as ever, and familiarity with the course of criticism and insight into the problems lead to the same conclusions. By comparison of the different reports, the relatively oldest Greek form of a saying may be established, and by observation of the tendencies at work in the centers whence the gospels have come later additions may be eliminated. Certain inferences may also be drawn from the earlier operation of these tendencies as to the changes a saying may already have undergone before the first Greek gospel was written. By such processes scholars have, without any consideration of the original Aramaic, reached the conviction that the earliest form of many a parable, address and apothegm was so different from the present form that it can be explained only by the persistence of an old tradition reflecting the immediate expression of an original and fruitful genius.

Divested of later modifications and additions, most of the parables are so unlike the proverbial sayings and similes that might be culled from Hebrew literature, so manifestly the products of one mind, so inconceivable, with their constant emphasis on the kingdom of heaven and the Father in heaven, as the instruments of a Messianic propaganda made by a group of demagogues or teachers in the interest of the Nazarene, or as a means of rallying men around the symbol of his name, a *nomen et praeterea nihil,* and so impossible to understand as anything else than utterances of the man who gave the first impulse to the great spiritual movement, that they are felt to be themselves evidences of his historical existence as well as of his character and thought.

Many students have been puzzled over the curious avoidance on the part of Jesus of assuming any recognized Messianic title, the impression that he did not accept recognition as the Messiah even from his disciples, the fact that he forbade his disciples to say that he was the Messiah, and his apparent reticence to the end in regard to his claims. The ordinary attempts to explain this peculiar attitude are quite unsatisfactory. It is supposed that he disapproved of the current Messianic idea, and had framed for himself a different idea anticipating the ecclesiastical conception of the Christ, and that he sought to prepare his disciples for accepting him as the Messiah in this higher sense. But of such pedagogical training there is no indication. He does not seem to have taught them the distinction between the good and powerful king of Israel and conqueror of the world whom his contemporaries regarded themselves as having a right to look for in accordance with the prophetic word and the wholly different kind of Messiah he considered himself to be. He can scarcely have cherished the ambition or hope of becoming the king of Israel and of the world in any sense without attaching to this office sufficient importance to communicate something of its nature to his closest disciples. Even students of the Greek gospels who have

left untouched the question as to the meaning of the term Son of Man have been led to see that the problem arises from the survival along with the new estimate of him as the Messiah, naturally modified by the impression of his personality and his spirit, of a primitive tradition that Jesus never claimed for himself Messiahship in any sense, present or future, political or metaphysical, and prohibited his disciples from making such claims for him, a tradition too old and strongly rooted to be eradicated.[1] The more marked the contrast is between this early tradition and the apostolic conception, the more unavoidable is the conclusion that the former can only be the reflection of the historic reality. How could those who proclaimed him as the Messiah have invented the difficulties they were at such pains to circumvent by the assumption that Jesus carefully guarded his Messianic secret until his resurrection should reveal it?

Similar facts, only secondary to this in importance, have been observed by many scholars.[2] Mark[3] has preserved the answer of Jesus to the young ruler addressing him as Good Master, "Why callest thou me good? None is good save one, God only." This certainly does not represent the later feeling concerning Jesus. Mark also records that the relatives of Jesus held him to be beside himself.[4] This is altogether probable, but it is not likely to have been invented at a later time. Schmiedel[5] has added to these passages the words "neither the Son" in Mark xiii, 32, and the cry on the cross, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" in Matthew xxvii, 46. But the first is lacking in the original text of Matthew xxiv, 36,[6] and likely to be an interpolation in Mark also. It

[1] See especially Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimniss*, 1901.

[2] See especially Schmiedel, articles *Gospels* in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, Vol. II, 1901.

[3] X, 17 ff.

[4] III, 21.

[5] *l. c.*, col. 1881.

[6] See the careful discussion by Merx, *Das Evangelium Matthaeus*, 1902, p. 356.

introduces a juxtaposition of "the Father" and "the Son" that is wholly foreign to the thought of Jesus, places "the Son" with emphasis above the angels, and only presupposes such a doctrine of subordination as was widely cherished in the Church throughout the second century and later. The second passage is a quotation from a supposedly Messianic Psalm, deemed appropriate by the Early Church, to be understood in the light of Semitic thought and Biblical usage, not well authenticated, since there is no disciple present to hear the words, improbable as an utterance of Jesus, either as a part of a Messianic programme or as a spontaneous expression of a sense of failure and a lack of faith in the midst of physical pain, and explicable at any time before the doctrine of the incarnation had been fully developed.[1]

More importance is to be attached to the remarkable fact that, while the evangelists certainly, and the Aramaic speaking followers of Jesus probably at an early time, believed that he had wrought an abundance of miracles, the gospels have nevertheless preserved an old tradition according to which he positively refused to work any sign, and declared that no sign should be given to his generation, except the sign of Jonah, by which he clearly meant the preaching of repentance. It has also been recorded[2] that he could not do any mighty works in Nazareth because of the unbelief of its people. The fact was, of course, the absence of miracles; and the explanation is an after-thought. An inventor might as well have ascribed to him miracles, and saved the explanation. But there was a strong tradition to reckon with. Occasionally it is possible to observe by the differing accounts of two evangelists, that while one has preserved the old statement that Jesus "taught the multitudes," another, "seeking for signs," has changed it into a narrative of how "he healed the multitudes." To some extent the misinterpretation of Old Testament language may have been

[1] See Brandt, *Die Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893, p. 240 ff.

[2] *Mark*, vi, 5 ff; *Matth.*, xiii, 58.

responsible for such changes. In Matth. xi, 5, Jesus answers the straightforward question sent him by John the Baptist, whether he is the Messiah or they should look for another, by a statement quoted from Isaiah xxxv, 5 ff., lxi, 1, that the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, and the poor have the gospel preached to them. It is evident that Jesus had in mind the obvious meaning of these words in the prophetic book. They are there figures of speech referring to the spiritual apprehension of God's ways and work. "Report to John," he virtually says, "that you have found the good news of the coming of the kingdom of heaven accepted by the sons of men." That seemed to him more important than the question as to the Messiahship. The evangelists, however, understood the saying literally, and did their best to find in the life of Jesus such works as he had positively declared should not be given to his contemporaries, in order that no detail of their Messianic picture should be wanting.

In various ways the conviction thus forces itself upon the historian that it is possible to go behind the records and to reach a trustworthy tradition, expressing itself first orally, then in the Aramaic gospel, which on critical points at least it is possible to restore with approximate accuracy, and finally in precious survivals preserved, in spite of the different conceptions of the evangelists, in the Greek Gospels according to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and, on rare occasions, in the Gospel according to John, the Gospel according to the Hebrews and elsewhere.

CHAPTER X

THE LIFE OF JESUS

When it is recognized that the Synoptic gospels, in spite of their late date and their didactic, rather than historical, character, contain survivals of an early tradition, all the more reliable as it contradicts the fundamental positions of these writings, a point of departure has been obtained whence it is possible to proceed to a critical sifting of the entire material. Transformations of original sayings and more exact statements of fact may be detected. Later accretions may be eliminated. The outlines of the historic figure of Jesus become discernible. What is thus positively gained may seem slight in comparison with the wealth of detail that once appeared to be available. Here as elsewhere we must be satisfied with knowing less, if we would have more accurate knowledge. But a handful of reasonably assured facts is worth more from the historical point of view than a vast mass of comparatively late traditions. A few glimpses of the real life of Jesus may allow us to perceive a career more natural, a spiritual attitude more comprehensible, a character of greater dignity and intrinsic worth, a teaching more profound than the evangelists, at their distance in time, with their historic limitations, and under the pressure of their peculiar religious demands, were capable of appreciating.

There is no valid reason to doubt that Jesus was born in Galilee, and that he was the son of a carpenter by the name of Joseph and his wife Mariam, or Mary. The event probably occurred a few years before the Dionysian era. Luke[1]

[1] The terms "Matthew" and "Luke" have been preserved, though in the preceding chapter it has been shown, not only that Matthew and Luke are not the authors of the Greek gospels bearing their names, but also that the first two chapters in each of these gospels are later additions, themselves of highly composite origin.

indeed brings the birth of Jesus into connection with the census under Quirinius that took place in the year 6 A. D.[1] But he also declares that the conception of John happened in the days of Herod, king of Judaea, and the natural impression is that this statement of time is intended to cover the angel's visit to Mary as well. Herod died ten years before the census of Quirinius, in 4 B. C.[2] As Matthew also places the birth of Jesus before the death of Herod, this seems to be the older tradition. Luke clearly believed that the census under Quirinius occurred in the days of King Herod[3], and saw in it an occasion for the journey of Joseph and his wife to Bethlehem where the Messiah was to be born. This is rendered more probable by the fact that he dates the public appearance of John in the fifteenth year of Tiberius,[4] 28 or 29 A. D., and regards Jesus, who manifestly

[1] II, 2; Josephus, *Ant.*, xvii, 355; xviii, 1. f. Cf. the excellent discussion of this census by Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes*, 3rd ed., 1901, I, 508-543. The name of the Roman official praised in the mutilated inscription found near Tivoli in 1764 has unfortunately not been preserved, and it is uncertain whether he is said to have been *legatus Augusti* twice, for instance once in Cilicia and Pamphylia and another time in Syria, or twice legate of Syria. The reference in Tacitus to the victory of Quirinius over the Homonadensians soon after his consulate in 12 B. C. does not prove that he was governor of Syria in 3-2 B. C., as long as it has not been shown that Cilicia belonged to Syria, and was not an imperial province, in the time of Augustus. Cf. Rudolph Hilgenfeld in *Zeitschrift für Wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 1880, p. 98 ff., and Adolph Hilgenfeld, *ibid.*, 1892, p. 196 ff. Ramsay has produced no evidence of a census in Judaea before 6 A. D. (*Was Christ born in Bethlehem?* 1898).

Tertullian's statement (*Adv. Marcion*, IV, 19) that there was a census in Judaea under Sentius Saturninus (9-6 B. C.) is without support and clearly erroneous. Before the death of Herod (4 B. C.) there can have been no Roman census in Judaea, and citizens of Galilee can have had nothing to do with any Judaean census.

[2] Cf. the discussion of this date by C. H. Turner in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, II, 483 ff.

[3] I, 5.

[4] III, 1. Before the time of Nerva civil years were reckoned in Rome by the consuls. In the exceptional cases when regnal years were used, they were counted from the actual day of accession. The year extending from the 19th August, 28, to the 18th August, 29, was

appeared soon after, as "about thirty years of age." While the statement is not as exact as it could be desired,[1] it unquestionably points to the earlier period. The story of the Magi and the massacre of infants in Matthew presupposes a tradition placing Jesus' birth in the time of Herod.

In John ii, 20 the temple is said to have been in building forty-six years. Herod began the main structure in 20 B. C. Archaelaus may have added a wing; there is no evidence or likelihood that the Roman procurators did anything to the temple. From 41 A. D. Agrippa I built on the sanctuary, and the temple was finished under Agrippa II in 65 A. D.[2] However the years actually spent on this enterprise may have been counted, no light is thrown by the statement upon the chronology of Jesus' life. In John viii, 57 the Jews ask, "Thou art not yet fifty years, and hast thou seen Abraham?" It may perhaps be inferred from this that the Fourth Evangelist looked upon Jesus as a man of at least forty years when this question was asked. Irenaeus[3] also records the opinion of some presbyters in Asia Minor that Jesus attained an age of between forty and fifty years. But it is doubtful whether, in either case, a genuine and old tradition can be assumed. If the story of the star of Bethlehem is connected with the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces or the succeeding still greater conjunction of these planets in Aries, and if Jesus was actually conceived or

probably regarded as the fifteenth of Tiberius's reign. But if the author was influenced by the custom prevailing in the time of Trajan, he may have considered the time from the 19th August to the 31st December, 14, as the first, and the tribunician year 28 as the fifteenth. The consuls of the year 29 were Rubellius Geminus and Rufus Geminus.

[1] Annas (6-15 A. D.) is wrongly made high-priest at the same time as Caiaphas (18-36 A. D.); Antipas is called only Herod; Philip is, contrary to Josephus, made Tetrarch of Iturea; Lysanias, who died 36 B. C., is made tetrarch at this time. "About thirty years" is quite indefinite. Even the fifteenth year of Tiberius may be Luke's impression merely of the account given by Josephus of Pilate's procuratorship. Cf. Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, III, p. 480.

[2] Cf. Keim, *l. c.*, I, 615 f.

[3] II, 22, 5.

born at the time when one or the other of these conjunctions occupied the attention of astrologers, his birth would have occurred between the spring of 7 B. C. and the end of 5 B. C. There can be no question about the astrological importance especially of the *conjunctio maxima* in 6 B. C.; but it may be seriously questioned whether the conception and birth of Jesus synchronized with the significant movements of the two planets. Nevertheless, it is not improbable that Jesus was born toward the end of the reign of Herod. The day of his birth is as little known as the year. The early church celebrated as his birth-day the festival of the epiphany of Dionysus on the sixth of January, and the Armenian church still continues this custom; the Roman church since the fourth century celebrates the *natalis solis invicti* on the twenty-fifth of December.

That the parents of Jesus lived in Nazareth, and that he was universally regarded as a native of that place, is the impression left by the gospels. It is uncertain, however, whether the Nazareth mentioned is identical with the present En Nazura. No town by this name occurs in the Old Testament, the works of Josephus, or the Talmud. Cheyne[1] questions its very existence in the first century, and explains Nazareth as Galilee, Nazarene in Matth. ii, 23 as Galilean, referring to Isaiah ix, 1 ff., the Talmudic *Jeshu ha nozeri*[2] as Jesus the Galilean, and, following Halévy and Wellhausen,[3] Gennesareth as Galilee. The most important of these positions would be tenable even if it should be possible to prove that there was a Galilean town of Nazareth. Halévy[4] looks for such a place near the Lake of Galilee. Of this, however, there is no evidence, and the modern Nazareth is most probably the place where Jesus was born. The story of the Magi[5] reveals the source of the idea that Jesus was born in Bethlehem. This story rests upon

[1] *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, III, 3360 ff.
[2] *Aboda Zara*, 17a.
[3] *Israelische und jüdische Geschichte*, 3rd ed., 1897, p. 266.
[4] *Revue Sémitique*, 1903, p. 232 ff.
[5] *Matth.*, ii, 1 ff.

the assumption current in antiquity that the fate of men and nations may be read in the stars. While the writer himself may have conceived of the star that went before the Magi "until it came and stood over where the young child was" as a new and startling celestial phenomenon, the tradition upon which he drew no doubt had its origin in the astrologically important observation that about the time when Jesus must have been born there occurred the greatest of all conjunctions, that of Jupiter and Saturn in the Zodiacal sign of Aries, the house of the sun at the vernal equinox. According to Kepler,[1] there was a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Pisces about the 22d of June, 7 B. C. and in February-May, 6 B. C., a still greater conjunction when Mars approached Jupiter and Saturn and, in addition to them, the sun with its satellites Venus and Mercury also appeared in or near Aries. He was quite justified in asking, "What could the Chaldaeans, following the still extant rules of their art, conjecture but an event of the very greatest importance?" The language of Matthew forced Kepler to assume that "together with and besides such very great conjunctions" a comet appeared.[2] Oefele has recently called attention to a demotic papyrus in the Berlin Museum giving the positions of the planets from 17 B. C. to 10 A. D.[3] This table indicates a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Aries from the 12th Epiphi 23 of Augustus's reign to the 8th Thot, 24, from the 5th Mechir to the 5th Epiphi, 24, and from the 1st Choiak to the 3d Mechir, 25. With the aid of such data and due observation of the apparent retrogressions of the planets, Oefele has figured out that the con-

[1] *Opera Omnia,* ed. Frisch, II, 708 f.; IV, 257, 347.

[2] *Opera Omnia,* IV, 257. Kepler does not seem to have given the technical sense of a conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in Aries to the term *conjunctio maxima,* but simply "a very great conjunction." He appears to think of the conjunction in Pisces as well as that in Aries and the concourse of other planets beside the largest ones in the same region of the sky, when he speaks of "solchen *conjunctionibus maximis.*"

[3] *Die Angaben der Berliner Planetentafel P.* 8279, and *Das Horoskop der Empfängnis Christi* in *Mitteilungen der Vorderasatischen Gesellschaft,* 1903, 2 and 6.

junction in Pisces referred to by Kepler ended seven days before the first conjunction in Aries, that there were three periods of conjunction in Aries interrupted by one in Pisces, that one of these periods began the 15th April, 6 B. C, that Jupiter became stationary, or "stood," in Aries on the 27th December, 6 B. C., and that Jesus was conceived on the 15th April of that year and found in Bethlehem on the 27th December by the Magi who had started from Jerusalem on the 25th November. Oefele shows by the testimony of cuneiform tablets that Babylonian astrologers were in the habit of predicting the effect of planetary positions upon Martu, or Syria. The value of his researches lies in pointing out how necessarily this conjunction, occurring only a few times in a millennium, must have led observers of the stars to look for extraordinary events and to find horoscopes implying unusual destines. There can be little doubt that astrology helped to create an atmosphere of expectancy at this time. But it should also be considered how natural it would be to conclude subsequently from the importance of a historic personality that his conception or birth must have been connected with the peculiar and rarely occurring position of the planets.[1] There are minor difficulties, such as the too short period between conception and birth, the too long journey from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, and the computation of the regnal years of Augustus. But these are of little consequence compared with the tremendous strain upon modern intelligence of the assumption that there really is a relation between the conception of a human being upon the earth and the greater or shorter distance between some of the planets in the sky.

In all probability, a Hellenistic Jew or a Gentile converted to Christianity toward the end of the first century was led by his knowledge of the *conjunctio maxima* in 6 B. C. to suppose that Jesus was born under those auspicious planetary influences, and to conclude that astrologers in the East must have seen his star (Jupiter near Saturn in Aries) and naturally come to worship him. That Magi

[1] This was clearly done in the case of Alexander.

from the rising sun might thus have journeyed far to pay divine homage to a great king, had been seen in the case of Tiridates and the Magi in his company, who in 66 A. D. had gone through Asia Minor to Rome to prostrate themselves before Nero, addressing him as a god.[1] An influence upon the legend from this source was suggested by Dieterich[2] and has been deemed probable by Usener[3] and Pfleiderer.[4] Thus understood, it sets forth in impressive symbolism the conversion of the Mithras-worshiping world to Christianity, the adoration of the new-born king of the Jews by the Magi, in contrast with the attitude of his own people who, though in possession of the prophetic word, refused to do him honor.

The story clearly indicates that it was the prophecy of Micah[5] which rendered it necessary to believe that as the Messiah he must have been born in Bethlehem. The Bethlehem meant is unquestionably the well known town in Judah where David was supposed to have been born. Cheyne[6] thinks of *Bethlehem nozeriyya,* or *zeriyya,* in Zebulon, 7 miles N. W. of Nazareth, a place mentioned in the Talmud.[7] But it is to be observed that this Bethlehem is only referred to in the birth-stories and is distinctly connected with David. At least since the eighth century Bethlehem in Judah was regarded as the birth-place of David. Only in recent times the accuracy of this tradition has been questioned.[8] Modern criticism is making Bethlehem again "little among the thousands of Judah," no longer to be hon-

[1]b *Dio Cassius,* LXIII, 2 f.

[2] *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft,* 1902, p. 1 ff.

[3] *Ibid.,* 1903, p. 19.

[4] *Das Christusbild des urchristlichen Glaubens,* 1903, p. 101. How far the star of Jacob in *Numbers,* xxiv, 17, influenced the legend, is difficult to say. Pfleiderer has also suggested *Isaiah,* lx, 1 ff., where the breaking forth of Yahwe's light is followed by the coming of the Sabaeans with gifts of gold and frankincense (*Das Urchristentum,* 2nd ed., 1902, p. 552 f.).

[5] *Matth.,* ii, 6; *Micah,* v, 1.

[6] *Encyclopaedia Biblica,* III, 3360 ff.

[7] *Megilla,* 70a.

[8] Marquart, *Fundamente israelitischer und jüdischer Geschichte,* 1896, p. 23 ff.

ored as the birth-place either of David or of Jesus. The massacre of the infants is inextricably interwoven with the visit of the astrologers from the East. Josephus records many a crime committed by Herod, but he knew nothing of such a deed. This silence remains strange, even when due weight is given to the reasoning of J. C. Vollborth[1] who called attention to the fact that Bethlehem cannot have had more than about a thousand inhabitants, so that the number of male children under two years of age is not likely to have exceeded a dozen. Far reaching conclusions have been drawn from Matthew's account of the flight to Egypt. Rabbis reported in the Talmud supposed that Jesus learned in Egypt forbidden magic,[2] and modern writers have thought that he acquired the wisdom of the Egyptians. The evangelist clearly indicates the source of this story. The flight was invented "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Lord through the prophet, saying, "Out of Egypt I have called my son."[3] It is unknown to Luke. Instead of a visit by Magi, this evangelist narrates the coming of shepherds to Bethlehem, who have been informed by angels that "a Saviour, who is Christ, the Lord, has been born in the city of David."[4] And from Bethlehem he lets the holy family go, not to Egypt, but to Jerusalem and thence "to their own city Nazareth."[5]

At the root of the various Bethlehem legends lies the conviction that Jesus must have been a true descendant of David. The genealogies in Matthew[6] and Luke[7] bear witness to this conviction. Both profess to give the pedigree of Joseph. One goes back to Abraham, the other to Adam; one runs through the royal line, the other follows a side

[1] In *Matth.*, ii, 16, 1788, summarized by Eichhorn in *Allgemeine Bibliothek*, 1789, p. 356 ff.

[2] Cf. *e. g. Shabbath*, 104b; *Sanhedrin*, 107b; *Sota*, 47a; pal. *Shabbath*, 14. So also the Jewish informants of Celsus.

[3] *Matth.*, ii, 14; *Hosea*, xi, 1.

[4] *Luke*, ii, 8 ff.

[5] *Luke*, ii, 39.

[6] I, 1-17.

[7] III, 23-38.

branch; one omits certain links to make the chain consist of three equal parts, the other adds links not found in the Old Testament. Both depend on the Greek version for the earlier period, and apparently upon some books akin to the Chronicles for some of the later names. Curiously enough, Shealtiel is the son of Jeconiah in Matthew, the son of Neri in Luke; Joseph descends from David's son Solomon and Zerubbabel's son Abiud in Matthew, from David's son Nathan and Zerubbabel's son Rhesa in Luke, and neither Abiud nor Rhesa are mentioned among the sons of Zerubbabel in Chronicles; in fact, Joseph's own father is Jacob in Matthew and Heli in Luke. The phrases "of Tamar" in vs 3, "of Rahab" and "of Ruth" in vs 5, and "of her that had been the wife of Uriah" in vs 6, are probably late additions by some one who desired to emphasize the contrast between the Davidic lineage of Jesus' putative father, with its undeniable taints, and the pure and spotless paternity of Jesus. The incomplete, contradictory and mutually exclusive genealogies only show that Jesus' grandfather was not known in early Christian circles. But while they do not prove the Davidic descent of Jesus, they are of great value in revealing the earliest tradition as to his immediate paternity. It was recognized long ago that no man could have undertaken to prove by the pedigree of Joseph the Davidic descent of Jesus who did not believe that Jesus was the son of Joseph. But this remained a critical conjecture until the discovery of the Sinaitic Syriac palimpsest. This version, made from a Greek text older than any we possess to-day, as is universally admitted, reads in Matth. i, 16, "Joseph begat Jesus." Some manuscripts of the old Latin version point to the same text.[1]

This is indeed out of harmony with the story of the virgin birth, as the contradiction to it given in verse 18 at once evinces, but the section containing it is clearly a later insertion. The profound influence of non-Jewish thought upon

[1] The fullest discussion of the passage will be found in Adalbert Merx, *Das Evangelium Matthaeus nach der Syrischen im Sinaikloster gefundenen Palimpsesthandschrift*, 1902, p. 5 ff.

the author of Matth. i, 18-ii, 23 cannot be denied. In the Graeco-Roman world the idea of a divine paternity was exceedingly common. Pythagoras was supposed to be a son of Apollo and Parthenis, Plato a son of Apollo and Periktione, Alexander a son of Amon Re or Zeus and Olympias, Seleucus a son of Apollo and Laodice, Augustus a son of Jupiter and Attia, Apollonius of Tyana a son of Zeus and a woman, and Simon Magus a son of the Most High and a virgin, to mention only a few examples among many.[1] In early Israel similar notions occur, as Gen. vi, 1 ff. and other passages show. But in later Judaism they seem to have disappeared except where contact with Greek thought is manifest, as in the case of Philo. According to him, Samuel was "born of a human mother" who "became pregnant after receiving divine seed;"[2] Zipporah was found by Moses "pregnant by no mortal;"[3] Tamar was "pregnant through divine seed;"[4] and Isaac was "not the result of generation but the shaping of the unbegotten."[5] This shows that even profound thinkers among the Hellenistic Jews occupied themselves with parthenogenetic speculations. Whether the wrong translation of *'almah* in Isaiah vii, 14 as "virgin" instead of as "young woman" contributed to the development of the doctrine of the virgin birth or was a welcome proof from the Scriptures of an already formed conviction, cannot be determined. But the author of the story may very well have been a Christian Jew. His familiarity with the Jewish law of betrothal speaks in favor of this view.

Originally, the account in Luke presented Mary as the wife of Joseph, accompanying her husband to Bethlehem, there giving birth to her first-born son with him, and stopping on the way home in Jerusalem after they had both been

[1] Cf. Usener, *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen,* 1898, p. 70 ff.
[2] I, 273, ed. Mangey.
[3] I, 147.
[4] I, 598.
[5] I, 215.

purified. Hillman[1] has convincingly shown that when the interpolated verses i, 34, 35 and the gloss "as was supposed" in iii, 23 have been removed, there is not the slightest intimation of a virgin birth in the text, but weighty evidence that the author can have had no such miracle in mind.[2] This disposes of the various attempts by Jewish rabbis and modern scholars to discover the real paternity of Jesus, as well as of the fiction of an immaculate conception. The currents of human life that united in the personality of Jesus bore through hidden channels from sources lost to view the strength and weakness of the race. To regard them as common and unclean was a serious departure from the spirit of Jesus that avenged itself by casting the shadow of a wholly undeserved suspicion on the humble family of Nazareth.[3]

[1] *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie,* XVII, 1891, 192 ff.

[2] *Luke,* i, 5-25, 41b, 46-55, 57-80, seems to have been drawn from a work originating among the disciples of John the Baptist. The *Magnificat* was originally put upon the lips of Elizabeth, as Völter has shown. (*Theologisch Tijdschrift,* 1896, p. 244 ff.). Harnack has called attention to the fact that both "Elizabeth" and "Mary" in vs. 46 are late (*Sitzungsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften,* 1900, p. 538 ff.), which would give the psalm to Elizabeth. The psalm is an imitation of that ascribed to Hanna, but significantly omits the supposed Messianic reference, and speaks of a "humiliation" of the Lord's handmaiden, appropriate in the case of Elizabeth, but not applicable to Mary. The legends concerning Hanna and Symeon are clearly of late origin.

[3] The story that Jesus was the son of a soldier by the name of Panthera was known already to Celsus in 178 A. D. (Origen, *Contra Celsum,* I, 32), and is frequently repeated in the Babylonian and Palestinian Talmuds. (See the original texts in Dalman, *Was sagt der Talmud über Jesum,* 1891). Panthera is probably a Greek anagram on the word Parthenos-Virgin, Bar Panthera thus playfully hinting at the "Son of the Virgin." Later Panthera was made the name of the alleged seducer of Mary. This anagram was suggested by P. Cassel in 1878 in his *Commentary on Esther* (Eng. tr., p. 336), and by J. Rendel Harris, *The Apology of Aristides* in *Texts and Studies,* Cambridge, 1893, p. 25. The name Panther also occurs in Christian genealogies of Jesus; cf. Epiphanius, *Haer.,* lxxviii, 7, but this probably is an attempted rehabilitation of Panthera. Ben-Sotada is generally explained "Son of this woman suspected of adultery,"

Concerning the early life of Jesus little is known. He may have been about twelve years of age when, in 6 A. D., the census of Quirinius caused an insurrection headed by the Galilean, Judas of Gamala in Gaulanitis, and it is not improbable that his youthful mind was already impressed with the weighty issues that were involved. About the same time he may have made his first pilgrimage to Jerusalem and seen for the first time animal sacrifices offered to Yahwe. If he asked any questions of the priests or the elders in the temple, they are likely to have concerned the sacrificial cult.[1] The child is the father of the man. From Mark vi, 3 ff. it is safe to conclude that Jesus was a carpenter and house-builder. This passage also shows that the

though this explanation is open to doubt. In modern times many writers have sought to account for the general characteristics of Jesus and his peculiar attitude to priests, scribes and Pharisees as well as to his mother and brothers by his supposed illegitimate birth. But the suspicion of illegitimacy is only a corollary of the late doctrine of a virgin birth. It is time that historic criticism should put an end to these groundless aspersions against the parents of Jesus with the survivals of pagan mythology that gave occasion to them. The carpenter of Nazareth and his good wife need no apology for giving to the world, as the fruits of tender and loyal affection, their first born son and his less distinguished brothers and sisters. But the Church in its maturity should seek to repair the injury done unwittingly by the Church in its childhood to this worthy couple, and to all sound family life, by the myths concerning the origin of Jesus.

[1] The nucleus of the story, *Luke*, ii, 41-51, belongs to the older stratum of tradition, as is clear from the modest rôle of Jesus, listening to the teachers and asking them questions, and from Mary's words, "Thy father and I were seeking thee." But the answer of Jesus, "How is it that ye sought me? Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?" is as clearly secondary. In his anxiety to mark the contrast between "thy father" and "my Father," the author has put upon the lips of Jesus a wholly unwarranted rebuke of his parents. Why should they not seek him? Whether we interpret "my Father's business" or "my Father's house," there is no question here of a conflict of duties to God and to parents, but rather a suggestion of that tendency to set aside manifest moral duties on a religious pretext, which Jesus himself so severely criticised in later life.

trade cannot have been merely a rabbi's avocation.[1] The astonishment of his neighbors is too genuine, and their knowledge concerning his outward career too reliable, to permit the idea that Jesus had been trained as a rabbi. The whole character of his teaching precludes the assumption. There is nothing to suggest that he had ever appeared as a teacher before his contact with John the Baptist. But there can be no doubt that the many years during which he quietly worked at his trade witnessed the growth of his moral and religious character and the development of his peculiar views of life. What the shaping influences were, cannot be determined with certainty. His later conduct and teaching suggest, however, that he learned more from observation of nature, intercourse with men, and communion with God, than from books. In the synagogue of Nazareth, Moses and the Prophets were read in the Hebrew, and probably a *methurgeman* interpreted in the Galilean dialect of the Aramaic the sections read. The prophetic books seem to have left a deeper impression on Jesus than the Law. If his home possessed any of these revered writings, it is likely that prophets and psalms were his favorite reading.[2] From the great prophets of his people he learned how freely men of the spirit had criticised what he supposed

[1] So apparently Brandt, who thinks that Jesus went through the school af Pharisaic Biblical erudition and thus became a rabbi, and who attaches much value to a Rabbinic decision handed down from Jesus the Galilean through an unknown disciple, Jacob of Kefar Sekanyah, to Rabbi Eliezer and quoted in *Aboda Zara,* 16b, 17a (*Evangelische Geschichte,* 1893, p. 449 ff.).

[2] There is no reason to doubt that he knew how to read and to write. An opportunity to acquire such knowledge was probably offered in the synagogue. Josephus seems to indicate that (*Contra Apionem,* II, 204), and the Mishna clearly shows it to have been the case in the second century A. D. (*Shabbath,* I, 3.) While all parents may not have given their children the advantage of such instruction, and it is difficult to determine how far the conditions of Judaea prevailed also in a small Galilean town in the first years of our era, it is safe to assume that a promising child was given the opportunity, or an intelligent young man was able to secure for himself a chance, of acquiring these elements of education.

to be Mosaic institutions, how strongly they had emphasized their conviction that God desired righteousness and not sacrifices, how strenuously they had opposed the resort to chariots and horses and urged a quiet reliance on the arm of God, and how constantly they had peered into the future for the signs of the great day of the Lord. Their influence upon him is unmistakable. On the other hand, his sayings do not reveal to what extent he was familiar with such wisdom-books as Job, Ecclesiasticus, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes, or whether he was at all acquainted with such works as the Psalms of Solomon, the earlier parts of Enoch, and Jubilees.

Both his daily occupation and his bent of mind tended to give him a livelier interest in the vital issues presented by the prophets than in the legal questions absorbing the attention of the rabbis, and to send him in leisure moments to the fountain-heads of inspiration and instruction rather than to the best cisterns. He was a sympathetic and thoughtful observer of nature. Revelations of deep significance came to him through rain and sunshine, land and sea, trees and flowers, birds and beasts. References to natural objects and phenomena are as frequent in his reported utterances as they are conspicuously absent in the rabbinic discussions of the Talmud, or the epistolary literature of the New Testament. His observation of human nature was keen rather than broad. He learned much from contact with men, even though his acquaintance was limited by the circumstances of his life. His disregard of conventional standards of judgment led him to put his own valuation upon the characters of men, their words and deeds. His half wondering, half reproachful question, "Judge ye not of yourselves what is right?" reveals a fundamental principle of his mental processes. He seems to have judged men by the manner in which they affected him more than by an impartial scrutiny of their actions, a nice balancing of merits and demerits, and a gradual approach to an adequate estimate by observation from many view-points. In this he was a son of the prophets, and of his race. The men with whom he came in contact were Hebrews, not Greeks. If in the fragmentary

record he seems to hurl his woes indiscriminately against whole classes, not only holding those responsible for entering in who had the keys, or demanding much of those to whom much had been given, but apparently failing to recognize the sincerity of those whose conservatism kept them in the beaten paths and condemning as hypocrites and thieves the entire body of religious leaders, the noblest men of his people had done the same before his time. It is probable that personal experiences and associations had a determining influence. He was a carpenter, as his father had been. His associates were humble folk, artisans, small tradespeople, tillers of the soil, fishermen. Grinding poverty, bootless labor, anxious care for the morrow, constant suffering from the pride, the greed and the lust of the well-to-do classes, discontent with the Roman yoke, the Idumaean dynasty and the heavy burdens of taxation, envy and distrust of the rich, the cultured and the respectable, were characteristic features of his social environment. To assume that Jesus had a certain class consciousness is not ascribing to him a distinctly modern sentiment. A man cannot have spent most of his life at a carpenter's bench and in a carpenter's home without looking out upon the world through a carpenter's eyes. Jesus could not have left his trade at the mature age of thirty without carrying with him a sympathy for the little ones, the needy, the oppressed and the outcast, and an understanding of their lot and character not so natural to men brought up in surroundings of affluence and social distinction.

It is difficult to determine how far the views of Jesus may have been influenced by the opinions of men with whom he was thrown into contact before the appearance of John the Baptist. It has been suggested that he may have been a member of a local Essene cult-community. This is, indeed, highly improbable. Even if such a brotherhood existed in the little Galilean town, it is not likely that Jesus was at any time sufficiently attracted by its principles and mode of life to identify himself with it. It seems improbable that, with his temper and in his circumstances, the anxious observance

of ceremonies, tabus, and sacred days, characteristic of the Essenes, could have appealed to him, or that he would have been willing to pledge himself to unquestioning obedience to superiors.[1] Nevertheless there was much in Essenism that must have found a ready response in his heart, if he was acquainted with it, and much in his own teaching and life that is most naturally explained by the supposition that he knew and was influenced by it. If he was familiar with the Essenes, he must have been favorably impressed with their simplicity of life, opposition to private wealth, contentment with their lot, kindness to the poor, disapproval of slavery, non-resistance of evil, healing of the sick, preference for celibacy, rejection of animal sacrifices, objection to oaths, reverent contemplation of nature, occupation with things to come and idea of a spiritual resurrection.[2] It can scarcely be an accident that so many of his own great convictions are also found among their leading tenets. Particularly impor-

[1] The tendency to allegorizing with which the Essenes are credited must also have seemed to him unnatural. How far this penchant as well as some of the Essene tenets were due to the direct influence of Greek thought, is difficult to determine. If Zeller went somewhat too far in this direction by making Essenism a mere reflection of Pythagoreanism, Lucius, on the other hand, erred by denying any relation and regarding Essenism as nothing but an exaggerated form of Pharisaism. Greek and Oriental speculation met in Essenism as in Pythagoreanism.

[2] Hilgenfeld is right in calling attention to the sporadic opposition in ancient Israel to the sacrificial system and the temple cult. In view of utterances by pre-exilic prophets, *Ps.*, l, *Isa.*, lxv, and other passages, Ohle's contention (*Jahrbücher für prot. Theologie*, 1887 and 1888) that the rejection of animal sacrifices proves that the Essenes cannot have been Jews, that therefore the Jewish sect described under this name by Philo and Josephus never existed, lacks all plausibility. Hilgenfeld believes the accounts, but also explains the Essenes as an originally non-Jewish tribe, whose existence goes back to pre-exilic times. Josephus is probably right in assuming that the Essenes came into existence as a party in the middle of the second century. Opposition to the illegitimate high-priesthood may have occasioned the forming of a party. Oriental (Indian and Persian) influences came later. The Greek influence may have come, either from Alexandria, where the Therapeutæ lived, or from the Greek Decapolis.

tant is his attitude on questions where the Essenes differed radically from the Pharisees. The latter believed in the principle of retaliation sanctioned by the law, in the bearing of arms, in the taking of oaths, in marriage and divorce, in the offering of animal sacrifices, and in the resurrection of the flesh on the last day. The views of Jesus on these points seem to have been either identical with or akin to those of the Essenes. His opposition to the legal principle of retaliation, and his insistence on the principle of overcoming evil with good were even more marked than those of the Essenes. Like them he rejected the oath. He remained unmarried. He seems to have commended celibacy, though recognizing the temporary value of marriage when kept indissoluble and without the possibility of divorce. He ignored the sacrificial system, or advised men to dispense with the proper performance of sacrificial acts in the interest of morality. Concerning the resurrection he seems to have believed, with the Essenes, that the good are raised immediately after death and continue to live with God in a form of existence like that of the angels, without sharing their belief in the preëxistence of the soul, the inherent evil of matter, and the survival of all souls. How far Essene thought affected Jewish society, even where there was no organized body of believers, is impossible to know. But the overlapping of different spheres of influence is a constantly observed fact. As the young Josephus seeking for the truth found a Banus, who cannot be affirmed to have been an Essene, but apparently stood religiously very near this body, so Jesus in his youth may have met some unknown teacher whose influence in some direction was as determining as that of John the Baptist later.

The word of God came to John, the son of Zechariah, in the wilderness in the fifteenth year of Tiberius.[1] There is

[1] *Luke*, iii, 1. Where the home of Zechariah and Elizabeth was is not known. The tradition that places it at 'Ain Karim does not go beyond the twelfth century. Cheyne (article, *John the Baptist* in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*) conjectures that 'Ain Karim is intended by "Aenon, near Salim," *i. e.*, Jerusalem, in *John*, iii, 23. But what

no valid ground for questioning the substantial accuracy of this statement of Luke. A number of arguments have been urged against its trustworthiness, such as the unquestionable inaccuracies of the immediate context, the report of Josephus that men looked upon Herod's defeat by Aretas as the judgment of heaven upon him for the murder of John the Baptist, which therefore could not have occurred a very long time before, and the apparently necessary close connection in time between the death of John, the divorce of Aretas's daughter, and the war of Aretas upon Herod. But Volkmar[1] is probably right in thinking that the journey of Herod Antipas to Rome on which he became enamoured of Herodias, the wife of his brother Herod Boethus, was undertaken early in the year 29 A. D. to offer condolences on the death of Julia Livia, to ingratiate himself with Sejanus, and to explain his conduct in the case of John, which might have given Pilate cause for complaint. This scholar probably also divined the truth, when he maintained that John the Baptist was imprisoned and some time later put to death in the fortress of Machaerus, then belonging to Herod's father-in-law Aretas, before Herod's journey to Rome and his marriage to Herodias. Josephus[2] was familiar with the story of John, his baptism, and the political excitement caused by his appearance, but he knew

kind of baptism could John have performed there? The phrase "because there was much water there" seems to indicate that the author thought of a good-sized stream. At Tell Nimrim, northeast of Jericho, which Cheyne regards as the place intended by Bethabara or Bethany ("beyond the Jordan" being considered as a gloss) there is at least such a stream. The *Onomasticon* of Eusebius gives us no real help. It is not improbable that John's home was somewhere near the Dead Sea or the Jordan, where Essenes and other Baptist sects seem to have flourished.

[1] See especially *Jesus Nazarenus*, 1882, p. 369 ff.

[2] *Ant., xviii,* 109 ff. There is no reason to doubt the genuineness of this passage. Had it been inserted by a Christian, he would not have forgotten the dramatic incidents of the gospels and ascribed a peculiar political character to John's career.

nothing about his having rebuked Herod for marrying the divorced wife of his brother.[1]

But while John's career was apparently ended before Herod Antipas had offended the zealots for the Law by marrying, contrary to Lev. xviii, 16, a woman who had been his brother's wife,[2] the death of the popular prophet was laid to his charge by many who possibly cared less about the chagrin of a foreign princess or even the degrees of mar-

[1] It is no longer quite as certain as it seemed in the days of Volkmar that Machaerus at the time belonged to Aretas. Niese, in his edition, has shown that the present manuscripts do not read *tote*, "then," but *tô te*, which probably favors the following translation: "She, however, had already before sent a message to Machaerus and to the (district) tributary to her father, and everything had been prepared for the journey by the general." This is supposed by Schürer (*Geschichte*, 3rd ed., 1901, Vol. I, p. 436) to mean that she sent word both to the fortress belonging to Herod, from whom she fled, and to the adjoining territory belonging to her father. But the connection between Machaerus and "the subject to her father" is too close to permit the thought of two different messages to officers of different governments, and the construction of a dative following a preposition with accusative is harsh. If this was the original text, it is more natural to suppose the meaning to be that she sent to Machaerus and the subordinate (masc.) of her father, the commander of the fortress. But it is difficult to believe that all the earlier editors of Josephus recorded the more natural reading without any manuscript authority. An *editio princeps* is often as good as a manuscript.

[2] It has long been recognized that Matthew made a mistake when he declared that Herodias was the wife of Philip (xiv, 3). Mark repeated the error (vi, 17). Luke, acquainted with Josephus, avoided it (iii, 19, 20) and spoke only of Herod's brother. Herodias was the wife of Herod Boethus, who lived in privacy in Jerusalem. Their daughter was Salome, who afterwards became the wife of Philip. The story of her dancing before Herod and being instigated by her mother to ask for the head of John the Baptist on a charger, which was reluctantly given to her by Herod on account of his promise to grant her anything "to the half of his kingdom," is generally acknowledged to be legendary. The historical Antipas "had no kingdom to divide" (Holtzmann). Herodias, considering her family an exceptionally good woman, had no grievance against John. Christian exegetes forget that bigamy was no crime according to the Jewish law.

riage forbidden in the Law, and it was this martyrdom of John that was remembered when he was defeated by Aretas, rather than the humiliation of Aretas's daughter. That some time passed between the flight of the Nabataean princess and the war that ended so disastrously for Herod, is evident from the narrative of Josephus which mentions boundary disputes. It should also be observed that Aretas scarcely had any grievance against Herod because of his marrying an additional wife, while Herod might have had cause for complaint in the disappearance of his Arabian queen. There is no necessary connection between the death of John in 28 or early in 29 A. D., the marriage of Herod to Herodias on his return from Rome in 29 A. D., and the great victory of Aretas in 36 A. D. Seven years is not too long a period for men to remember a prophet in whose light they have rejoiced to walk, and the memory of the martyred prophet is especially long-lived, even though the year and day may not be accurately recalled.

If John appeared in 28 A. D. and was imprisoned and put to death before Herod's departure for Rome in 29 A. D., it was probably some time early in the latter year that Jesus came to listen to his preaching. The Gospel according to the Hebrews[1] seems to have recorded that his mother and brothers urged Jesus to go with them to be baptized by John. He at first objected on the ground that he was not conscious of any sin, but afterwards changed his mind, considering that this assertion may itself have been a sin. It is not impossible that this story has preserved the memory of two facts: that the whole family was moved by the account of John's preaching to go to the Jordan, and that Jesus at first objected to the ceremony of immersion and the ostentatious confession of sin. This would be in harmony with his later attitude. Oscar Holtzmann[2] accepts the whole story on the ground that it could not have been invented by those who believed in the absolute sinlessness of Jesus.

[1] Jerome, *Contra Pelagium,* iii, 2; Cyprian, *De rebaptismate,* xvii. From this gospel the passage found its way into the *Predicatio Pauli.*

[2] *Leben Jesu,* 1901, p. 93 f.

This is indeed true, but hardly conclusive. The narrative appears to be early, without being wholly reliable. The motives that led Jesus to go were no doubt his desire to hear the words of a living prophet and his eagerness for every sign of the coming of the kingdom of heaven. It is a precious indication of his faith that he did not regard prophecy as a thing of the past but was ready to hear the word of God from the lips of one of his own contemporaries. When he saw the stern prophet of the desert, with his unshorn hair and his leathern girdle, and heard his fierce denunciation of the mighty and the wise in their own conceit, and his earnest demand for righteousness of conduct, the prophets whose words he had read seemed less great. The first impression must have been overpowering. Even later, when he had learned to discount the value of this message and was himself proclaiming an ideal higher than any that John ever dreamed of, he continued to regard the Baptist as the greatest of all prophets. It is uncertain whether John immersed others in the Jordan, or set an example of immersing himself in its waters.[1] In any case, the act was well understood to be something else than an ordinary washing, to remove the uncleanness of the flesh. It was a sacred bath, symbolical of repentance and the desire to live a clean life. Hence he forbade some to come to his baptism who declared that, as sons of Abraham and members of the holy nation, they were acceptable to God, and who showed no fruits of repentance. Jesus appears to have submitted to the rite. Later tradition associated various miraculous features with the event. There was a fire;[2] the heavens were rent asunder; a dove appeared; this dove was the Holy Ghost; a voice was heard by Jesus himself or by John; the *bath kol* proclaimed him to be the Messiah; it said to him

[1] The latter is the inference drawn from the title by Brandt, *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893, p. 457 f.

[2] Justin seems to have read of a fire in his copy of Matthew, *Dial. c. Tryph.*, lxxxviii, 315, so also the *Predicatio Pauli*, the *Gospel acc. to the Ebionites*, quoted by Epiphanius, *Adv. haer*, xxx, 13, and old Latin versions.

"Thou art my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased," or "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee," or "My Son, in all the prophets I expected thee, that thou shouldest come, and I should rest on thee; for thou art my rest, thou art my only begotten Son, who reigneth for ever;"[1] or it said of him, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." The Baptist was represented as hesitating, feeling that it would be more appropriate for him to be baptized by Jesus, whom he recognized as the Messiah, than the reverse, but was graciously reminded that "Thus it behooves us to fulfil all righteousness." This is clearly a secondary thought. It is manifest from John's later message[2] to Jesus that nothing of this kind had actually happened, and that the thought of Jesus possibly being the Messiah did not come to him until he began to receive reports of the public ministry of the latter. That Jesus in the water had an ecstatic vision which convinced him that he was the Messiah, is supposed by some critics. But there is no indication that he was a visionary, no ground for assuming that he regarded himself as the Messiah, and no justification for such a construction of the vacillating and mutually exclusive traditions. Nevertheless, the event had unquestionably a decisive influence on his future. He had identified himself with the prophetic movement. How long he remained with John, we do not know. The period must have been comparatively short, as the Baptist's career was soon cut off by his arrest. Antipas was apparently forced by political considerations to interfere. As the cry arose on every side, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand!" he had good reason to fear an intervention by the Romans similar to that which twenty-three years before had deprived his brother Archelaus of Judaea and Samaria.

The arrest of John was an unmistakable call to Jesus to take up his work. It is probable that the news reached him in Galilee. If so, he seems to have left the Baptist, either as a propagandist, or from a growing sense of disappoint-

[1] *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews*, Jerome, *Com. in Isaiam*, xi, 2.
[2] *Matth.*, xi, 2 ff.

ment, or to wait for further providential leading. There is a tradition that he was carried by the Spirit to the desert to be tempted by the devil.[1] Possibly it might be inferred from this that he sought solitude for meditation, and that his residence for some time was unknown to his relatives and remained so to his disciples. Matthew, Luke, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews give in different order and different language accounts of the Satanic temptations that assailed him. He was tempted to satisfy his hunger by making bread out of stones, to cast himself from the pinnacles of the temple and to fly in the air, and to fall down and worship the devil in order to obtain all the kingdoms of the world which he saw from an exceedingly high mountain. There is of course, no more reason to believe that Jesus was seriously troubled by desires to turn stones into bread, to soar above the earth before gaping crowds, or to rule as an emperor even at the cost of worshiping the devil, than that he actually was carried through the air by the devil to the roof of the temple, or to a mountain so high that from its peak he could see round the globe. The original impulse to such narratives may have been the saying of Jesus recorded in Luke xxii, 28. They seem to typify the sort of temptations supposed to assail the Messiah. The devil was supposed to find the material for his temptations in Messianic prophecies, and Jesus was supposed to have overcome them by falling back upon passages in the Scriptures relating to man's duty. "Man shall not live by bread alone;" "man must not tempt the Lord, his God; man must worship God alone and serve him." These were indeed pivotal thoughts with Jesus. Such words may have been heard from his own lips. In harmony with them his life had been lived. It had not been dominated by selfish considerations; it had been marked by patient endurance of the evils of the day; it had been sustained by the good message that came from above. His sensitive soul had shrunk from the presumption of testing how far God might go in helping him to perform miracles; he had learned to distinguish be-

[1] *Matth.*, iv, 1-11; *Luke*, iv, 1-13.

tween the sympathetic ministry of healing, whatever his views may have been as to the source of disease, and the faithless faith that seeks to lean upon an Almighty Power in undertaking sensational, unprofitable and impossible tasks. He had understood the essential impiety of all political autocracy, and had shown no more desire to become a king of the Jews or an emperor of the world than to become a devil-worshiper.

All the Synoptic gospels record that Jesus went about in Galilee proclaiming the coming of the kingdom of heaven before he made Capernaum the center of his activity. But only Luke[1] has the story of his preaching in the synagogue of Nazareth and his being driven out of the town. Such an announcement in Nazareth that the acceptable year of the Lord had at length come, and that the fulfilment of the Old Testament prophecies concerning the Messiah were now to be expected, no doubt seemed to the evangelist an appropriate beginning of Jesus' ministry. He was unable, however, to carry out the scene without betraying its unhistorical character by the allusion to the great works already done in Capernaum, the premature rejection of Israel and choice of the Gentiles, his escape by a miracle, and otherwise. Some of the sayings may have been uttered by him at a later time. Walking along the sea of Galilee Jesus became acquainted with two brothers, Simon also called Peter, and Andrew, and they followed him. They also seem to have offered him the hospitality of their home in Capernaum.[2] Two other brothers, John and James, sons of Zebedee, soon after became his disciples. At Capernaum Jesus spoke in a synagogue. What he preached was not that the Messiah had come, and that he was the Messiah, but that the kingdom of heaven was at hand. God would reign over men and make them happy; let them therefore turn away

[1] IV, 16-30.

[2] Possibly Tell Hum where ruins of a synagogue exist. But "the fountain called Kapharnaum" (Josephus, *Bell. jud.* III, 519 f), was in the plain El Ghuweir, either Ain Tabighah, or, more probably, Ain Mudhawarah. The ruins of an acqueduct do not prove that the district Tell Hum bore the same name.

from their sinful, selfish ways, and accept in glad confidence the message of good things to come. The apocalyptic literature clearly shows that without speculating on any Messiah many minds occupied themselves in Israel with this thought of a perfectly realized theocracy, a new order of things to be ushered in by God. God himself was to be the king. But there were also those who looked eagerly for an occupant of the throne of David and a conqueror of the heathen nations. It is not impossible that this dream of vengeance and the pomp of empire unbalanced some minds, or caused an excitement so violent as to suggest demoniac possession. If there is a basis of fact in the narratives of demons who recognized Jesus as the Messiah, it may have been the exclamation of some such person. It is not impossible that an instance of this kind led to the theory that the demons, because of their superhuman knowledge, possessed the secret of his identity. But it would be quite hazardous to assume that the exact language of such ravings has been preserved, and Mark is so clearly under the influence of his theory that any such utterance is subject to doubt.

In the Synoptic gospels Jesus appears not only as a preacher to whom at first the crowds gladly listened, but also as a physician by whom multitudes were healed from various diseases. Because some of his patients are described as possessed by demons, and the cures as being effected by the casting out of these demons, and because the accounts have often savored of the miraculous, critics have at times cast doubts on all narratives of healing. In this they have probably been wrong. Jesus no doubt shared the common belief in demons, and the common explanation of some diseases as caused by temporary or permanent demoniacal possession. We may, if we choose, regard his diagnosis as faulty. There is no reason to doubt that he believed in exorcism. He freely recognized that the Pharisees were able to cast out demons,[1] and he encouraged his own disciples to practise exorcism. We may reject the

[1] *Matth.*, xii, 27.

remedy with the explanation of the disease. But we have no right to question the occasional efficiency of this treatment. Granted the sincerity of belief on the part of physician and patient alike, the earnest conviction that the evil can be overcome by the influence of a stronger and holier spirit, the firmness of will, the power of suggestion, the calm serenity of confidence, the quickening touch of sympathy; the result, particularly in the case of nervous disorders, is too well attested to admit of doubt. However erroneous the analysis may be, however mistaken the theory, however absurd the formulas, the psychic stimuli and sedatives, the subtle forces disturbing or restoring the equilibrium, may operate to the welfare of the organism. The physician may not himself be able to explain the source of his power. Especially is this likely to be the case, if he has had no scientific education, but finds himself possessed of extraordinary skill and insight. Not every one was intended by nature to be a physician who had the advantages of a medical training, nor was everyone sent to the schools whom nature ordained to the healing ministry. This is true in every age. Jesus seems to have ascribed his power to a spirit, distinct from himself and working through him.[1] The best evidence that he actually wrought some cures is the early tradition, still preserved in our gospels, that he sometimes did not succeed at all, and at other times effected only a temporary improvement, the sufferer relapsing again into his former condition. But the great importance of this practical work supplementing his teaching lies in the disposition that led him to undertake it and the spirit in which he continued it. Actuated by sympathy, he served men freely, making his gift neither a source of revenue nor a stepping-stone to power.

Jesus seems to have feared the outbursts of enthusiasm that greeted his words and deeds. He retired to solitary places, but the crowds sought and found him. He entered

[1] *Matth.*, xii, 28.

other towns, like Chorazin[1] and Bethsaida,[2] and people soon began to flock around him there. As his fame reached the prisoner in Machaerus,[3] John sent a message to him asking whether he was the Messiah or they should look for another.[4] Jesus called the attention of the messengers, in figures of speech borrowed from the Old Testament, to the spiritual revival they were witnessing, but said nothing about Messiahship. He neither desired that John should look upon him as a claimant for the throne of David, nor would he encourage him to go away from the manifest signs of God's presence in search for some aspirant to royal power. Soon after, John the Baptist was put to death. The agitation on behalf of the Baptist by his disciples, following the manifest disavowal of Messianic claims by Jesus, may have determined Herod to take his life. Immediately upon this event, Herod seems to have undertaken his journey to Rome. On his way he visited his brother Herod Boethus in Jerusalem, and fell in love with Herodias. On his return, she had secured a divorce, and he married her. Some people objected to the marriage, not on the ground that he had another wife, for that was lawful, nor because she was divorced, for that was permitted in the law, but on account of the legal prohibition against marrying a woman who had been a brother's wife.[5] It is interesting to observe that no censure on the part of Jesus has been recorded, though he did not hesitate to characterize the chief magistrate of his people as a "fox,"[6] and he objected to bigamy and divorce as well. When Herod heard of Jesus, he is said to have expressed his belief that he was none else than John the Baptist raised from the dead.[7] Whether the words are actually his or not, they show how current the opinion was that

[1] The modern Kerâzeh.

[2] Probably on the site of the ruins called Et Tell, though some scholars have thought it at Khan Minyeh. Tell Hum is also possible.

[3] The modern Mukaur.

[4] *Matth.*, xi, 2 ff.

[5] *Leviticus*, xviii, 16.

[6] *Luke*, xiii, 32.

[7] *Matth.*, xiv, 2.

men may be raised immediately after death, and how similar the two teachers were. In his estimate of John the Baptist,[1] Jesus reveals his admiration of the great teacher, but also the consciousness of his limitations. He admired the firmness, the courage, the moral earnestness, the simplicity of life that characterized the prophet of the desert, without concealing from himself the failure of his terrifying message to reach and cleanse the deep-lying fountains of life. Because, with all his greatness, he lacked insight into the secret of the most radical and permanent moral and religious influence, he still belonged to an order destined to pass away.

It is impossible to state how long time had elapsed when Jesus was recalled to Capernaum by a message from the Roman centurion who had built the synagogue in which he had once preached.[2] He desired him to heal a favorite slave. The messengers were Jewish elders, and superintendents of the synagogue. While on the way to comply with this request, Jesus is met by a new deputation urging him not to defile himself by entering the house of a Gentile, but to heal by a word of command, as he no doubt could do. In this atmosphere of faith the slave, whose sickness is not indicated, recovered. Besides adding greatly to his influence in Capernaum, this incident is likely to have led him to reflect on the artificiality of that barrier between Jews and Gentiles which the principle of faith so triumphantly overstepped. Crowds gather in the house of Simon to hear him, and the sick are carried there to be healed. A certain class of diseases is generally explained as due to demoniacal possession, but a man does not come into the power of a devil, unless he has sinned. The sufferers are therefore constantly tormented by the consciousness of unforgiven sin. The Pharisees taught that only God can forgive sins. His forgiveness can manifest itself in two ways: by priestly absolution in the name of God, and by removal of the penalty, the new condition of health revealing acceptance with God.

[1] *Matth.*, xi, 7 ff.

[2] *Matth.*, viii, 5 ff.; *Luke*, vii, 1-10.

Jesus shocked many of his hearers by assuring the despondent patients that their sins were forgiven, and even more by declaring that man has the right to forgive sins.[1] This privilege of assuring men that their past sins need not stand in the way of their entering into proper, trustful and happy relations to God, when they have abandoned their sins and their disposition is right, is not reserved by Jesus for himself, or made the prerogative of a priestly class, but freely assigned to his disciples and to all men. Nor does this emphasis of the forgiveness of sin in the case of the sick show that Jesus shared the common prejudice that sickness, accident, and sudden death are tokens of exceptional sinfulness. He knew that the men on whom the tower of Siloam fell were not sinners above those that escaped[2] and that the field on which no rain fell did not necessarily belong to an unjust man;[3] but he also knew that, because of the common doctrine, the sick man and the afflicted were in most need of such assurance.

There seems to have been a custom house at Capernaum. Travelers across the Sea of Tiberias probably paid toll or duty. The officer receiving the duties belonged to a class thoroughly hated and despised, and generally in proportion as they did their work faithfully. Such tax-gatherers had many temptations to practise extortion or embezzlement, and were often regarded as little better than thieves. Their apparent alliance with the detested Roman power caused them to be socially ostracized. The name of the customs official in Capernaum was Levi, the son of Alphaeus.[4] This man became one of the leading disciples of Jesus. Others of the same class were drawn into the circle. Among the women who with eagerness listened to his words there were those whose reputation was bad, either because it was known that they had lived in irregular relations, or it was sus-

[1] *Matth.*, ix, 6.
[2] *Luke*, xiii, 4.
[3] *Matth.*, v, 45.
[4] He seems also to have been known as Matthew; *Matth.*, ix, 9-13; *Mark*, ii, 13-17; *Luke*, v, 27-32.

pected that they had, or their possession by demons made it evident that they were sinners. A woman from Magdala[1] by the name of Miriam had seven times been cured by Jesus. What her real disease was is not known. Without the slightest shred of evidence she has been made by ecclesiastical tradition an abandoned woman, and vulgar rationalism has added its quota to the Mary Magdalene legends by gratuitously making her the mistress of Jesus. It is important that Jesus did not feel it to be his duty to hold aloof from men and women who, for one reason or another, were shunned by polite society, respectable people and religious leaders. He conversed with them; he greeted them; he ate and drank with them.

If this attitude to the socially ostracized gave rise to unfavorable comment, criticism increased when it was learned that he never fasted. It was so difficult to conceive of a prophet who did not show his sainthood by asceticism, that his mode of life seemed to some critical observers like a perpetual debauch. It began to be said: "He is a glutton and a wine-bibber."[2] John could be understood; he ate locusts and wild honey, drank no wine, let his hair grow, and wore a leathern girdle. But what manner of man was this who ate bread with publicans and drank wine with harlots, and never stopped to fast? When he was asked why he did not fast, he said that it was not worth the while to put a new piece on an old garment or to pour new wine into old skins.[3] The old and the new will not mix, and compromises are of no permanent value. Most offense, however, was caused by his breaking the sabbath. Once his disciples went through a field on the sabbath and, as they were hungry, picked the grain and husked it between their fingers. When they were accused for this, he defended them by saying that David set aside the law when he demanded of Abimelech at Nob the shew-bread which none but the priests were permitted to eat, and that the priests

[1] *Luke*, viii, 2. Possibly Mejdel, or some place in the vicinity.
[2] *Matth.*, xi, 19.
[3] *Matth.*, ix, 14-17.

every sabbath broke the day of rest by carrying on their sacrificial work.[1] It matters little that he forgot the name of the priest[2] and that he wrongly supposed the priestly regulation he had in mind to have been in force in the time of David. He squarely faced the issue, and defended sabbath-breaking by citing an instance when the law, as he thought, was broken by David, and a fact showing that even the priests did not observe the absolute cessation of work. Nor did he claim any special dispensation for himself and his disciples. He grandly concluded his answer by declaring that the sabbath was made for the sake of man, and not man for the sake of the sabbath, and that therefore man is lord also of the sabbath. He regarded it as a matter for man himself to decide what he should do with his day of rest. On any day he deemed it right to do what was in itself right and good, and on any day he considered it wrong to omit a deed of kindness that could be done. Hence he worked as a physician on the sabbath as well as on other days.

It would be difficult to overestimate the importance of this breach with the Law. Aside from circumcision there was no custom prescribed in the Mosaic Codes on which more stress was laid than on the observance of the sabbath. It was one of the chief characteristics of Judaism in the eyes of other nations. The opposition to Jesus on the part of the conservative religious leaders grew too strong for him to remain safely in Capernaum. He retired with some of his friends to the sea-shore. But he could not escape his growing fame. People came from all parts of Galilee in search of him. He was forced to move about from place to place. While the crowds came and went, there gradually formed about him a little band of men and women who followed him withersoever he went. Tradition has it that he chose twelve men to be his disciples.[3] The precise number is not certain. It may be that "the twelve" is merely expressive

[1] *Matth.*, xii, 1 ff.; *Mark*, ii, 23 ff.

[2] According to *Mark*, ii, 26, he said Abiathar instead of Abimelech.

[3] *Matth.*, xi, 1 ff.; *Mark*, iii, 13 ff.; *Luke*, vi, 13 ff.

of a later idea that there should be one apostle for each of the twelve tribes of Israel. The number of the twelve apostles is as fictitious as that of the twelve patriarchs and the twelve tribes, and tradition was quite uncertain in regard to their names. The comparatively small group of men and women that thus attached itself more permanently to the Galilean teacher was probably the result of natural selection rather than of a formal choice. They received a twofold education for future service. The importance of his teaching which they enjoyed is generally recognized. But not less valuable was the communal life informed by his spirit in which it was their privilege to live. They had left all their former relations and all that they possessed for the kingdom of heaven. They lived simply, and their scanty needs were met especially by the means of the women who devoted their property to the cause,[1] but also by the individual efforts of the fishermen,[2] and by free gifts. What they had, they held in common. One among them seems to have been entrusted with the administration of their finances.[3] The common meal was a symbol of their unity. They gladly shared their bread and fish with the people that came to listen to Jesus. Such services as each could render were freely given. They worked for the good of men according to their ability and opportunity, as all men should; they lived on charity, as all men in reality do, kings as well as beggars, but the principle was too potent to permit the existence among them of either kings or beggars. No one lorded it over his brothers, least of all Jesus himself. The need of intimacies and of solitude was recognized. Jesus often communed with Peter, James and John; and he at times retired for a night to be alone with himself and the Heavenly Father. It was not an ideal society; but Jesus

[1] *Luke*, viii, 3.

[2] Peter obtained by fishing the money to pay the temple-tax; and that was surely not the only time he followed his trade.

[3] *John*, xii, 6, may have been drawn from a trustworthy source. Cheyne's conjecture (article *Judas* in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*), "he was a harsh man" for "he was a thief," has much to commend it.

earnestly sought to embody in its life the principles of the coming kingdom of heaven, to make it a sample of the society that was to be. And it certainly was pregnant with some ideals that are yet waiting for recognition in human society at large.

The so-called Sermon on the Mount is probably not a sermon addressed to a large congregation of people; it is doubtful whether it was spoken on a mountain or on a plain; and it is not certain that either Matthew[1] or Luke[2] has recorded the address in its original form. Its ringing sentences were apparently first uttered in the privacy of his more immediate followers. Both as a method of instruction and as a means of self-protection, Jesus seems to have adopted the use of the parable for public discourse.[3] It is indeed improbable that he spoke to the people exclusively in parables. He certainly answered directly many a question, and many an epigrammatic saying has no doubt been preserved from a public address not at all confined to the narration of parables. But it is altogether likely that he employed by preference the parabolic form of teaching when he found himself confronted by a mixed and partly hostile audience, while he spoke more directly and openly in the presence of his disciples and friends. The searching criticism of fundamental principles of the Mosaic law and of the common practices of piety as well as the unfolding of the higher righteousness of the kingdom of heaven may plausibly be regarded as having formed a part of his private instruction. Yet there is nothing esoteric about this teaching. He never set forth in public views different from, and more acceptable than, those he presented in private, and made no attempt at concealment of his real attitude to the Law. He

[1] V, 1 ff.

[2] VI, 20-49.

[3] The object was of course not to conceal from men in general the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven or to harden their hearts and make them ripe for their doom, as *Matth.*, xiii, 10 ff. and parallels represent it. Jesus spoke to be understood and to lead men to repentance and knowledge of the truth; but the result seemed to the evangelists to be none else than that described in *Isaiah*, vi, 9 ff.

freely denounced as immoral the conjugal relations of the Pharisees, though they lived quite in harmony with both the letter and the spirit of the law. There is scarcely a principle laid down in the Sermon on the Mount that is not expressed in parables, repliques, or epigrams addressed to the multitudes or to his enemies. It is possible that in such familiar intercourse with his disciples Jesus at one time suggested what it would be proper to pray for, the advent of the kingdom of heaven, bread for the coming day, pardon for sin, and freedom from temptation.[1] Such desires were of course to be voiced in the closet, and not in public. The church made a formula of these suggestions, enlarged the number of its petitions, and recited it in public.

As some of his disciples entered into the spirit of his teaching and felt his power, they began themselves to address the crowds. Upon one occasion some who had gone ahead of the company had not only preached repentance and announced the coming of the kingdom of heaven, but had also succeeded in casting out devils, *i. e.*, in healing sick persons. They came rejoicing and reported this to Jesus. He shared their joy, and exclaimed: "I see Satan falling from heaven."[2] If they could do what he did, the good time was certainly coming when the power of Satan over men would be ended. As dangers surrounded them, he encouraged his disciples to be brave, and not to fear men who could only kill the body, but not, as God, the soul also.[3] In his wanderings Jesus once came to the other side of the lake where the ten Greek cities were.[4] The story is told that outside of one of them he drove out a demon called Legion from a man and allowed the demon to enter a herd of swine which rushed into the sea and were drowned.[5] What

[1] The account in *Luke*, xi, 1-4, is more original than that in *Matth.*, vi, 9-15. Various additions have been made to the four objects possibly mentioned by Jesus. The *Gospel according to the Hebrews* shows by its *lehem mahar* that the bread for the coming day is intended.

[2] *Luke*, x, 17-22.

[3] *Luke*, xii, 4, 5.

[4] With the exception of Scythopolis.

[5] *Matth.*, viii, 28-34; *Mark*, v, 1-20; *Luke*, viii, 26-39.

actually happened, cannot be determined. The fact that between the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. and the insurrection of Simon bar Kozeba in 132 A. D. a Roman legion was located in that part of the Decapolis seems to have had something to do with the form of the story. The extraordinary calm and self-possession of Jesus in the midst of a storm may be sufficient to account for the story of his walking on the water.[1] According to the reported words of Jesus, the daughter of Jairus was not dead, but asleep, probably a deep comatose sleep, from which he aroused her.[2] This seems to have been the basis of reports to the effect that he could raise even the dead. Whether the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand grew out of a misunderstood saying of Jesus,[3] or developed from an actual experience of a small supply of bread and fish going very far to satisfy a large crowd, must be left in doubt.

Conditions in Galilee became more insecure for Jesus and his disciples after a number of Pharisees had arrived from Jerusalem, either from curiosity or for the purpose of checking the dangerous movement.[4] They may have been invited by Galilean Pharisees who had been seriously scandalized by the life and teaching of Jesus, and offended by his unmeasured denunciations. He had attacked them as a class, very much as Amos and Hosea, Isaiah and Jeremiah had attacked priests and prophets without discrimination. His compassion for the multitudes that were like sheep without a shepherd had intensified his distrust of these teachers who had the key to the understanding, but neither entered in themselves nor permitted others to do so, and his indigna-

[1] *Matth.*, xiv, 22-33; *Mark*, vi, 45-52. But miracles of a similar sort related of Moses, Joshua, Elijah and Elisha may also have helped to shape the story.

[2] *Matth.*, ix, 24; *Mark*, v, 39; *Luke*, viii, 52. As this cure has grown into a veritable miracle under the hands of the Evangelists, so the accompanying story of the woman who had an issue of blood is likely to have grown. No reliance can be placed on the words said to have been spoken. It was clearly a faith-cure.

[3] *Matth.*, xvi, 6, 10 ff.

[4] *Matth.*, xv, 1 ff.; *Mark*, vii, 1.

tion at their self-complacency, formalism, and greed. The learned men from the Judaean capital soon observed that the disciples of Jesus did not wash their hands before their meals. This was an important discovery. What did Jesus teach concerning sacred ablutions? He promptly came to the defense of his disciples. No, he did not believe in these ceremonies. They were the traditions of men by which the commandments of God were set aside. Lest they should misunderstand him, and imagine that he had only drawn a distinction between the oral law and the written law, he hastens to make it plain that he rejected the whole system of tabus laid down in the Old Testament. "Hear me, all of you, and understand!" he cries. "There is nothing from without the man, that going into him can defile him; but the things that proceed out of the man are those that defile him." Mark correctly understood him: ("This he said) making all meats clean."[1] He had broken with the Law in regard to the tabus, as he had in regard to the sabbath.

The Pharisees then tried to persuade the people that he cast out demons through the power of Beelzebul, chief of the demons.[2] Jesus met the attack by pointing out that, if Satan drives out Satan, his kingdom is divided against itself and cannot remain (good would be accomplished through the evil spirit possessing him), that a man cannot enter and plunder a strong man's house without binding him first, that the exorcists among the Pharisees would be liable to the same heinous charge, and finally that this accusation was not merely slander against a fellow-man, but blasphemy against the good spirit through which the demons had been cast out. Whatever is said against a man may be forgiven, but blasphemy against the divine spirit cannot be forgiven.

This conflict must have revealed to Jesus, if he had had any doubts on the point, how little hope there was of finding Judaea better prepared than Galilee for his radical gospel. He determined to leave his people, at least tempora-

[1] VII, 19.

[2] *Matth.*, xii, 24 ff.; *Luke*, xi, 14 ff.

rily, and to betake himself to Phoenicia. Before departing, however, he seems to have desired to see once more his native town. But in Nazareth he found himself unable to do any mighty works.[1] He could effect no cures in an atmosphere of scepticism and hostility. His mother and brothers who had gained the impression that he was beside himself,[2] when they visited him on a former occasion, are not likely to have given him any comfort now. It is possible that people clamored for miracles, or at least for such wonderful healings as had been wrought in Capernaum, that they who thought they knew him so well pointed out some of his defects, and that he suggested his conviction that God had a work for him to do among the Gentiles by mentioning the examples of the Phoenician woman and Naaman.

With a heavy heart, no doubt, he went into exile. There is no reason to question the assistance he gave to the child of a Phoenician woman.[3] But the conversation that is said to have taken place is quite incredible. It is as impossible to believe that Jesus should have refused to help a sufferer in Northern Syria on the ground that it would not be right to help a dog of a Gentile, as that he would praise as an instance of marvelous faith her willingness to debase herself by accepting such a gratuitous insult in order to secure a favor. It is sad enough that a Jewish Christian was still capable of inventing this story. The more difficult it was to make his thought understood in these foreign parts, the more anxious Jesus must have been to commend his message by deeds of kindness. How long he remained abroad, we do not know.

On a visit to Caesarea Philippi[4] the purpose seems to have matured within him to go to Jerusalem in order to proclaim there the coming of the kingdom of heaven.[5] The carpenter

[1] *Mark*, vi, 5.
[2] *Mark*, iii, 21.
[3] *Matth.*, xv, 21-28; *Mark*, vii, 24-30.
[4] The modern Bâniyâs.
[5] *Matth.*, xvi, 13 ff.; *Mark*, viii, 27 ff.; *Luke*, ix, 18 ff.

of Nazareth knew very well that no man undertakes to build a house without first counting its cost. He had already had an encounter with the scribes of the Holy City, and knew what to expect. There also was great danger in the Messianic speculations. To gauge the precise extent of this danger, he asked his disciples what men were saying about him. They answered that some regarded him as John the Baptist; some, as Elijah; and others, as Jeremiah, or one of the prophets. If this answer was in a measure reassuring, there still remained a possibly more serious danger. What did they think themselves? Peter declared that he believed him to be the Messiah. By this he probably meant that he hoped he was the one who should deliver Israel. Whether this was the expectation of the whole band of disciples, or only Peter's own view, and how far Peter looked upon the Master's words as a leading question, and felt called upon to make a proclamation that would change the career of Jesus, cannot be known. But Peter was doomed to disappointment. It was not the first time he had failed to divine the purpose and meaning of the words of Jesus. But never had be been more quickly undeceived and disenchanted. Jesus charged his disciples not to say that he was the Messiah. He did not wish that men should believe in him as the Messiah and confess him as such. That is perfectly clear from what has been permitted to remain in the account. What more he may have said to change their views upon the subject, and to show them how foreign to his mind were the hopes of royalty, we can only surmise from a statement thickly overlaid by a later tradition. He began to show them how dangerous was the mission on which he was setting out, how probable it was that he would meet with the fate of so many a prophet before him. When Peter, full of the dreams of empire, nevertheless held up his Messianic hope, and in the name of God protested against any fears of suffering and death, he was sternly rebuked by a "Get thee behind me, Satan, thou art a stumbling block to me, for thou mindest not the things of God, but the things of men!" It is impossible not to see the tremendous anxiety of Jesus

to put a stop to these Messianic delusions. Ecclesiastical upholders of the authority of Peter thought to change this stumbling block into a rock on which a church might be built, but it remains a stumbling-block to an understanding of the spirit of Jesus.

The story that Jesus on the following sabbath was transfigured before his disciples, that his garments became glistening, exceeding white so as no fuller on earth can whiten them, and that Moses and Elijah appeared with him,[1] seems to have been patterned after the story in Exodus xxxiv, 27-30 of the glory on Moses's face when he came down from the Mount, under the influence of these stories of the mysterious body, which some accounts of the resurrection showed him to have possessed, like that of the risen or translated heroes of ancient Israel. As a foil, the evangelist pictures the vain attempts of the disciples at the foot of the mountain to cast out a devil from a sick boy, his impatience with them for not having faith enough to expel the devil, his own successful exorcism, and his explanation that the particular kind of demon possessing the boy could be driven out only by prayer and fasting. The account is scarcely historical.

Having set his face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem, Jesus desired once more to visit the scenes of his labors in Galilee. No crowds welcomed him this time in Capernaum. It is evident that his radicalism, condemned by learned and pious men, had made even the common people afraid of having anything to do with him. It was not safe to expose oneself to the fascination of his eloquence, or to receive temporary benefits at the risk of possibly dealing with Beelzebul. There could be no doubt that he had rejected the divine law. Therefore he was himself rejected. The tax-gatherers who in the month before the Passover were collecting the half-shekel paid by every Israelite according to the law[2] for the support of the temple service were not sure whether he had put himself so far outside the pale of Judaism as to refuse

[1] *Matth.*, xvii, 1 ff.; *Mark*, ix, 2 ff.; *Luke*, ix, 28 ff.

[2] *Exodus*, xxx, 11-16.

to pay this tax.[1] They had reason for asking Peter in regard to the matter, as the attitude of Jesus showed. He at once began to question the propriety of paying this tax. Were they to be forced to pay a tribute in money to God, as foreign subjects are forced to pay to an emperor, or were their relations to God to be free from such exactions, like those of sons to an earthly ruler? Jesus broke with the principle of compulsory support of religion, as he had with the principle of compulsory sabbath-keeping or observance of religious tabus. Whether he also meant to intimate that those who realized such filial relations to God might leave the supply of flesh for the altar and delicacies for the priests to those who in reality were strangers to God and his spiritual demands, is less certain. In any case, he thought it expedient to make the payment, Peter obtaining the necessary amount by resorting to his old trade.[2]

Jesus first planned to go through Samaria to Judaea. He did not share the common prejudice against this people, as the parable of the Good Samaritan shows. It was quite customary for Galileans to pass through Samaria on their way to Jerusalem. But conflicts often arose between Jews and Samaritans. Jesus seems to have sent James and John to prepare the way.[3] These hot-headed and ambitious men met with opposition, and came back expressing the wish that fire might fall from heaven and devour the Samaritans. Jesus rebuked them for cherishing the spirit of the old prophet Elijah. He then decided to go through Peraea. While there, some Pharisees warned him that Herod would put him to death.[4] They probably feared that he would remain in Peraea. He requested them to tell "the fox" that he was doing good by casting out demons and was on his way to Jerusalem, which should show that he was not afraid of death, for Jerusalem had killed many a prophet.

[1] *Matth.*, xvii, 24 ff.

[2] It is perfectly obvious how the miracle of the coin in the fish's mouth originated.

[3] *Luke*, ix, 51-56.

[4] *Luke*, xiii, 31-33.

Some characteristic episodes may have occurred at this time. A young lawyer asked him: "Good Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life?" Jesus objected to his calling him "good," as none but God could be said to be good, told him to live a righteous life in harmony with God's commandments, and finally advised him to sell all that he had and join the little company.[1] His departure gave Jesus occasion to comment on the difficulty with which the rich could enter the kingdom of heaven. On the other hand, the rude act of his disciples in pushing aside some women who wanted Jesus to touch their little ones, gave him an opportunity to praise the little children as happy because they would live to see the blessings of the kingdom of heaven,[2] and to point out that only those who had a child-like spirit were fit for the coming society. Some ambitious request by the sons of Zebedee or their mother had been rebuked by Jesus in private; then he felt it necessary to impress upon the whole company the difference between his ideal of society and the actually existing forms of social life. The latter were based on authority and obedience to authority, the former on service and ambition to serve.[3]

In Jericho, people gathered to see the Galilean prophet. The superintendent of customs, a man by the name of Zacchaeus, climbed up in a tree to have a better view. When Jesus perceived him and learned who he was, he asked him to receive him and his companions in his house. This Zacchaeus gladly did.[4] The usual criticism of such fraternizing with publicans was made by the Pharisees.

Some evangelist read in the book of Zechariah[5] a passage supposed to refer to the Messiah, in which a king enters Jerusalem seated on an ass. Not understanding the parallelism characteristic of prophetic and poetic style, he added an ass's colt, and made the Messiah ride on both.

[1] *Matth.*, xix, 16 ff.; *Mark*, x, 17 ff.; *Luke*, xviii, 18 ff.
[2] *Matth.*, xix, 13 ff.; *Mark*, x, 13 ff.; *Luke*, xviii, 15 ff.
[3] *Matth.*, xx, 20-28; *Mark*, x, 35-45; *Luke*, xxii, 24-30.
[4] *Luke*, xix, 1-10.
[5] IX, 9.

This could not, of course, refer to the still expected advent of the Messiah. For that was to be in the sky. There was no room for its fulfilment, therefore, except at the last entrance of Jesus into Jerusalem. The evangelist cherished no doubt that the prophecy had then been fulfilled, and felt confident that the people must by this sign have recognized its king and hailed him joyously as their Messiah.[1] But that Jesus should have suddenly changed his whole view of life and his attitude to the royalist movement, that he should have sacrificed his prophetic ministry, conceived in so lofty a spirit, to fan the flames of a political insurrection, that the man, whose convictions had led him to break with fundamental principles of the law at the risk of reputation and life, and had resisted as a satanic temptation the idea of marching to power by the means of the aspirant for a throne, should have deliberately set about to arrange the details of a sensational entry into Jerusalem in accordance with a misunderstood prophetic passage, is as inconceivable as the development of the story is easy to explain. The death on Calvary was not so tragic as such a surrender of his ideal would have been.

The event that really brought about the violent end of his career was of a different character and in perfect harmony with his life and his convictions. In Bethany,[2] near Jerusalem, he found a restful home with two sisters inclined to show hospitality to the Galilean prophet.[3] From here he quietly entered the city, and betook himself to the temple. What he saw, as he stepped into the outer courts, stirred

[1] Matthew (xxi, 1) states that Bethphage was the village where the two asses on which Jesus sat were procured. Mark, who knew that Jesus had friends in Bethany maintains that this was the village (xi, 1). Luke (xix, 29) combined the two so unskillfully that Bethphage, which is nearer to Jerusalem, came first. The story in Matthew has the appearance of greatest originality: the *mise en scène* is most dramatic, and the Old Testament basis most evident.

[2] The modern El Azariyeh.

[3] *Luke*, x, 38 ff. is probably out of its true chronological order. The time of the visit is likely to have been that referred to in *Luke*, xix, 29.

his spirit profoundly. Everything indicated that this was not a house of prayer, but a house of slaughter. He had in mind a prophetic word that this should be a house of prayer for all nations,[1] and he found only provisions for the sacrificial cult. He was shocked. The concentration of this cult in Jerusalem had made it possible for a pious Jew living at a distance from the city to commune with his God without giving much thought to the animal sacrifices. In all his teaching he had himself but rarely referred to the matter, and then only to indicate the greater importance of morality justifying even disregard for the legal injunctions in regard to sacrifices.[2] Here the service of God by the slaughter of animals, so sharply criticised by the great prophets of the past, stared him in the eye and filled his soul with loathing. He made a lash and began to drive out the money-changers and the sellers of animals for sacrifice, repeating the words, "My house shall be called a house of prayer." Apparently he also predicted the destruction of the temple, as Jeremiah had done, though it undoubtedly was a false witness who claimed that he had threatened to destroy it himself, and promised to build it up in three days.[3] The real significance of the event lies in the fact that, like the great prophets before the exile, he had attacked the sacrificial system and had voiced his conviction that religion was not dependent on the existence of the temple.

The hierarchy had been touched in its holiest interests, and Sadducees called him to account and sought to ensnare him by questions.[4] By what authority did he disturb the peace in the temple? His rejoinder plainly indicated the answer. It was the prophet's authority, the authority of a John the Baptist; and this they did not dare to question because the people held the prophet of the desert in high honor. As they supposed him to share the opinions of the

[1] *Isaiah*, lvi, 7.

[2] *Matth.*, v, 24; cf. *Matth.*, ix, 13, xii, 7, and *Mark*, xii, 28-34.

[3] *Matth.*, xxvi, 61.

[4] *Matth.*, xxi, 23 ff.; xxii, 23 ff.; *Mark*, xii, 18-27; *Luke*, xxi, 27-28.

Pharisees, they thought they might find a vulnerable point in the doctrine of the resurrection for which there was no authority in the Law or the Prophets. Whose wife would a woman be in the resurrection who had had seven husbands? His answer showed that he did not hold the common Pharisaic view. He believed that those who were accounted worthy of a resurrection were raised immediately after death, and based his belief upon the power of God, and apparently also upon his love, quoting the manner in which God calls himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, when speaking to Moses centuries after the death of these men.

It was a dangerous trap that was set for him by the Pharisees and the Herodians by their question whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Caesar.[1] A negative reply would have shown that he favored the establishment of an independent state. If he had desired recognition as the king of Israel, he might have gained sympathy by quoting prophetic promises of independence. But his answer was unmistakably in the affirmative. It was right to render unto Caesar what was Caesar's. The use of Caesar's money implied the recognition of Caesar's civil administration; the acceptance of its advantages involved the assumption of its duties. He was not concerned about forming a new state with its own money. He was anxious that the duties toward God should be recognized. When God received what belonged to him, his kingdom would come. This answer shows no indifference to the embodiment of righteous principles in the social life of man, but emphasis on what Jesus regarded as its only sound foundation.

At Bethany Jesus was invited to the house of a Pharisee, who may have been called "the leper" because at one time afflicted by a cutaneous disease.[2] A woman who was known as a "sinner" here poured oil out of an alabaster cruse over

[1] *Matth.*, xxii, 23-33; *Mark*, xii, 18-27; *Luke*, xx, 27-40.

[2] *Matth.*, xxvi, 6-13; *Mark*, xiv, 3-9; *Luke*, vii, 36-50. In earlier times, as to-day, the term "leprosy" covered a number of skin-diseases, some of them curable.

his feet. Simon demurred at this on the ground that Jesus must have known what kind of woman she was, as his disciples afterwards did on the ground that the contents might have been sold and given to the poor. But Jesus showed Simon how he failed to understand the woman's nature, and what a precious foundation for a reformed character such a love as hers was. A later tradition made of her act, by a forced interpretation, an anticipatory anointment for his burial, a thought as foreign to Jesus as to the woman.

While the storm of opposition grew, and leading men in both the great parties cast about how to accomplish his overthrow, Jesus seems to have conversed with people during the day in the temple, which was safer than any other place, and to have retired each evening either to his friends in Bethany or to some secluded spot in the neighborhood. When it was possible to have a common meal, as of old in Galilee, it was a festive occasion. Though he realized the gravity of the situation and was prepared for the worst, Jesus appears to have maintained his usual attitude of chastened joy and firm confidence. It was afterwards remembered that at the last meal which the little company had together, he had spoken of the joy with which they would eat their bread and drink their wine when the kingdom of heaven should come.[1] Twelve years ago the present writer[2] had reached the conviction that Jesus did not on this occasion, institute any ceremony or request his disciples to eat and drink in remembrance of him. It then seemed probable that in celebrating the paschal meal, he had with his accustomed spontaneity and freedom exclaimed when he saw before him the broken bread, ("This is) my body!" and as he looked into the cup filled with red wine, ("This is) my blood!" Continued reflection on the elements of the problem has forced him to accept the conclusions of Eichhorn[3] and other scholars, that even this remnant must be given up. Jesus does not seem

[1] *Luke*, xxii, 18.

[2] The *Significance of Christ's Last Meal* in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1892, p. 1 ff.

[3] *Das Abendmahl*, 1899.

to have celebrated the paschal meal. He was probably put to death by the Jewish authorities before the time had come for eating the Passover. All the eucharistic formulas seem to represent the later growth of the Christian institution and reflect theological speculation on the significance of the death of Jesus.[1]

There is every reason to believe that Jesus in these days more than once sought solitude for prayer and meditation. While the disciples slept, he weighed the tremendous issues of his cause and implored divine guidance. It is not necessary to inquire how the words of his prayer became known. The Church knew very well what he must have prayed for, and believed that angels were sent to comfort him,[2] without seeking for testimony from his sleeping disciples. It was a long time before Christological considerations would have prevented an evangelist from putting upon the lips of Jesus words in which he subordinated his will to God's.

Jesus was arrested in the garden of Gethsemane,[3] so called from an oil-cellar in the place, by a band of men among whom there were some servants of the high-priest, and taken to the palace of Caiaphas. At first his disciples seem to have made a show of resistance. At least one of them drew a sword and injured a servant of Caiaphas. Jesus told him to put up his sword, "for he that taketh to the sword shall perish by the sword."[4] He was true to the last to his doctrine of non-resistance. One of the followers of Jesus, who for some reason had left him and disappeared, was afterward suspected of having led the band to Gethsemane. So many legends have clustered about his figure that it is quite

[1] In the large building called En Nabi Daud one is shown the room where the last supper took place. The tradition goes back to the seventh century. Already in the fourth century there stood on this spot a Church of the Apostles. But it was apparently not thought of then as the *Coenaculum*.

[2] *Matth.*, xxvi, 36-46; *Mark*, xiv, 32-42; *Luke*, xxii, 39-46.

[3] It is not known where this garden was. The Franciscans have one Garden of Gethsemane, the Russians another. Neither can be very far away from the place where Jesus was arrested.

[4] *Matth.*, xxvi, 51, 52.

impossible to determine what part, if any, he had in helping the men to find Jesus. We have no reliable data from which to form a judgment of this man.[1]

Was Jesus tried in accordance with Jewish law, and of what crime was he convicted? It has been repeatedly shown that the trial as described in the Gospels is out of harmony with the legal procedure prescribed in the Mishnaic tractate *Sanhedrin*, and its Talmudic amplifications. The highest court of the Jewish people could not convene in the night, could not condemn an accused person on the same day that his case was taken up, could not sit on the day before a sabbath or the day before a festival, could not convict without the concurrent testimony of two witnesses, could not deliver a verdict without a majority vote, and in the case of blasphemy could not condemn unless the utterance in question was a plain and unmistakable blasphemy. We know these legal principles only as they appear in the codification of R. Jehudah at the end of the second century, and works that are still later. In the main they were no doubt recognized in the time of Jesus. But we also know that many provisions in the interest of the accused were flagrantly disregarded by the Sadducean party. The examination during the night in the house of Caiaphas is likely to have been only a private meeting. Whether Pharisees strongly prejudiced against Jesus would have made an objection to an extraordinary session on the day before the sabbath, or would have insisted upon a true indictment, sufficient testimony, and a second session, is doubtful, since the Sadducees could be made responsible for the irregularities. In the light of the historic conditions it would be quite unwarranted to conclude, as some have done, that Jesus cannot have been tried at all by the supreme court of Jewry, seeing that the rules laid down in the Mishna were manifestly not followed.

It is evident that the high-priest was obliged to dismiss as irrelevant and insufficient any testimony offered by witnesses. The charge that Jesus had seduced men into idol-

[1] Cf. Cheyne, article *Judas* in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*.

atry was clearly not made at all; it was at a much later time that such an accusation was framed. No Jewish court could have construed the prediction of the coming of the Messiah, or even the claim to be the Messiah, into a blasphemy. What occurred at the private meeting of the enemies of Jesus, or the session of the Sanhedrin, can only have been a matter of conjecture on the part of the disciples of Jesus.[1] They naturally supposed that he must at last have been asked on oath whether he was the Messiah. The remarkable thing is that the earliest tradition on this point was too strongly reminiscent of Jesus' attitude to the Messiahship to allow him, even under oath, to affirm that he was the Messiah[2] and Luke[3] still felt that he must have preserved his incognito, refusing to commit himself, and merely hinting at the future fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy. Only Mark,[4] writing to Gentiles to whom the term Christ had an entirely different meaning, made him admit that he was the Christ. We shall probably never know whether Jesus maintained throughout a dignified silence, or, stung to the quick by unjust charges and imputations, bore witness once more, in burning words, to the faith that was within him. Whether he was silent or spoke, his doom was decided upon beforehand.

"We have a law, and according to that law he shall die."[5] This was substantially the message of Caiaphas to Pilate. The Roman procurator would fain set him free. But the highest representatives of this subject people proclaimed that he was an insurgent, a pretender to the throne, a politically

[1] A consciousness of this lack of testimony may have led to the statement that Peter entered in to see the end, *Matth.*, xxvi, 58, but the story that Peter denied his master where he was sitting "without in the court," vs. 69, shows that no emphasis was put upon Peter's nearness to the scene as verifying the account.

[2] XXVI, 64.

[3] XXII, 67-70.

[4] XIV, 62.

[5] *John*, xix, 7. The correctness of the words cannot be vouched for, and the addition "because he made himself the Son of God" reveals the later standpoint of the evangelist.

dangerous character, whom he could not allow at large and remain a friend and trusted servant of the emperor. Pilate understood well enough the nature of this extraordinary anxiety about the welfare of Tiberius and the integrity of the empire. He would have been amused at their simulated fear lest the Roman yoke should be broken and Judaea become independent, had he not been so strongly impressed by the personality of this latest victim of their religious intolerance. Political considerations, however, forced him to follow the usual Roman method of not interfering with the laws of the subject nations. The Jews did not possess the "right of the sword." They must obtain permission of the procurator before they could inflict the death penalty. Pilate finally "handed him over to them to be crucified."[1] And they crucified him. Our earliest witness to the text of the Gospels, the Sinaitic Syriac version, renders it certain that the execution was not done by Roman soldiers, but by the Jewish authorities.[2] How far he was subjected to personal indignities, is difficult to say. He certainly was not scourged by Pilate, and probably not by the Jews.[3] The mock-coronation may also be a later feature brought into the story by persons familiar with the widespread custom of crowning a criminal as mock-king for some time previous to his crucifixion at the end of the year.[4] But the Jews who crucified him divided between themselves his garments, and as they sat and observed his end they wrote in derision on his cross in Aramaic "king of the Jews."[5] Before the crucifixion they had, according to Jewish custom, offered him wine mixed with myrrh,[6] in order to relieve his suffer-

[1] Luke's account of Pilate's sending Jesus to Herod (xxiii, 6 ff.) is subject to grave doubts, and is probably unhistorical.

[2] It is the merit of Merx to have called attention to this fact, *Das Evangelium Matthaeus,* 1902, p. 416 ff.

[3] See Merx, *l. c.,* p. 408 ff.

[4] See J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough,* 1900, II, 171 ff.; III, 138 ff.

[5] So the altogether credible narrative in the Sinaitic Syriac version of *Matthew.*

[6] *Matth.,* xxvii, 34. The Sinaitic Syriac has wine, not vinegar. This is probable. It has gall; this is likely to be a mistake for an earlier myrrh.

ings, and rob him of consciousness. It has generally been taken for granted that Jesus must have been crucified by the Romans, on the ground that crucifixion was a peculiar Roman punishment not prescribed in the Jewish law. It must be remembered, however, that impalement or hanging in some form was exceedingly common among the Semitic nations, that the Deuteronomic law (xxi, 22) mentions hanging on a tree as a penalty which Paul regards as equivalent to crucifixion, that the Jews adopted such Roman punishments as death by the sword not prescribed in the law, that already Alexander Jannaeus had adopted crucifixion as well, as he crucified eight hundred Jewish rebels in the midst of the city,[1] and that there were good reasons why this form of punishment used by the Sadducean rulers should have been abolished in the later penal codes. It should not be necessary to emphasize to-day that the condemnation and execution of Jesus by Jewish authorities, with permission of the Roman procurator, furnishes no justification for the age-long persecution of Jews by Christians. There is no nation whose conservatives have not waged war upon such radicals as Jesus, or whose prophets have not known the fellowship of his sufferings.

Tradition ascribed to Jesus several utterances on the cross. Matthew and Mark have only the improbable quotation of the twenty-second Psalm.[2] Luke[3] substituted for the cry of God-forsakenness another word from the Psalter,[4] "Into thy hands I commit my spirit" and also added the beautiful prayer,[5] "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do," as well as the promise to the robber,[6] "To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise." The Fourth Evangelist went his own ways. Placing the beloved disciple and the mother beneath the cross, he had a word

[1] Josephus, *Bellum judaicum*, I, 97 f.
[2] *Matth.*, xxvii, 46; *Mark*, xv, 34.
[3] XXIII, 46.
[4] *Ps.*, xxxi, 6.
[5] XXIII, 34.
[6] XXIII, 43.

for each. He made him exclaim, "I thirst,"[1] and the parting word was the statement by the incarnate Logos who in his person had revealed God, "It is finished."[2] Historical is the inarticulate cry of anguish with which he gave up the ghost, heard by the women who stood afar off. The Gospels narrate that he was buried in the tomb of Joseph of Arimathaea, a rich man who had secretly been a disciple of Jesus.[3] It is natural to suppose that this feature owes its origin to the prophecy in Isa. liii, 9 "They made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death." But it may also be that the body was buried, on account of the festival, in a plot of ground said to have belonged to this man.[4]

[1] *John*, xix, 28.

[2] XIX, 30.

[3] *Matth.*, xxvii, 57 ff.; *Mark*, xv, 42 ff.; *Luke*, xxiii, 50 ff.; *John*, xix, 38 ff.

[4] It is not known where Jesus was crucified and in what spot his body was laid when taken from the cross. The gospels call the place of execution Golgotha (*Gu(l)gulta, Kranion, Calvaria*), or the Place of the Skull, and declare that it was near the city. This only shows that the spot must be sought outside of the walls enclosing the city in his time. The oldest tradition is attached to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre. It goes back to Constantine, who, in removing a temple of Venus and laying the foundations of a Christian basilica, unexpectedly came upon a cave or tomb (Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*, iii, 25). We are not informed on what grounds it was identified as the tomb of Jesus. After a starting-point had thus been found, it was not difficult to discover all the other sacred sites that now group themselves about this shrine. The main objection urged against this tradition has been removed by the excavations and researches of Schick and Clermont Ganneau, which have tended to prove that the second wall ran south of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and that Jewish tombs actually exist within this enclosure, near the Jacobite Chapel and in the house of the Coptic Bishop. The present writer has been told by priests that there are other tombs below the so-called tombs of Joseph of Arimathaea and Nicodemus, but has not been able to verify these statements in spite of repeated attempts. The presence of these tombs is not altogether favorable to the tradition, since it raises the question whether it is likely that such a resting-place for the dead could have been chosen for an execution. In recent times, Thenius, Gordon, Conder and others have suggested as a possible site the knoll

It is quite impossible to determine when the death of Jesus occurred. The Synoptists seem to have regarded his ministry as occupying one year. But they were palpably influenced by the prophecy of "the acceptable year of the Lord;"[1] and it is difficult to escape the impression that they have recorded events that must have occupied considerably more time. On the other hand, the Fourth Gospel has generally been understood as stretching out his ministry through three years. This, however, is not certain, as the festivals recorded may be only those of one year, beginning with one passover and ending before the other. It appears probable that the official career of Jesus lasted more than a year, though it cannot be decided with our present data how long it was. There have been many attempts to determine the date of his death by the Jewish calendar or astronomically, but none are convincing. That Jesus died on a Friday, and that this Friday was the 14th of Nisan, is probable. All evangelists agree that it was on the eve of the sabbath. The gospels according to John and Peter make this Friday the day when the paschal meal was eaten; the Synoptic gospels make it the day following that when the Passover was celebrated.[2] The second representation may have been as strongly influenced by the idea that Jesus must have eaten the paschal meal, as the former was by the idea that he was put to death on the day when the paschal lamb was slain. Intrinsically, it is most probable that the authorities were anxious to have this work done before the

above "Jeremiah's Grotto," northeast of the Damascus Gate, urging in favor of this theory that the present north wall was the second wall of the city, that the place has the appearance of a skull, and that, according to a Jewish tradition, it was the place of stoning. But the first of these arguments can no longer be maintained; it is by no means certain that the name was derived from the configuration of the hill, and quite doubtful whether, even before a part of it was blasted away, it had any real resemblance to a skull; and the Jewish tradition is modern. Others have suggested other hills north of the city. The question cannot be settled in the present state of our knowledge.

[1] *Isaiah*, lxi, 2.

[2] See Schmidt, *The Significance of Christ's Last Meal*, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1892, p. 1 ff.

festivities began. If the Jews of the period had arranged their festive calendar by the astronomical new moon, it would be a comparatively easy matter to find in what year, during the procuratorship of Pilate, the 14th Nisan fell on a Friday. But they seem to have determined the appearance of the new moon by ocular observation dependent on the weather. In addition the system of intercalary months is not sufficiently known to enable us to decide in which of these years a thirteenth month was introduced. It, therefore, seems hopeless to settle the question. Ginzel[1] has again called attention to the fact that of the nine lunar eclipses that occurred between 29 and 33 A. D. only the partial eclipse on April 3d, 33, was visible in Jerusalem. While an eclipse of the moon on the day when Jesus died may have given rise to the story of a great darkness covering the whole land for three hours, it is not safe to draw any conclusions from this bare possibility. He must have died before the end of 36 A. D., the last year of Pilate's administration. If he was born about 6 B. C. and began his ministry in 29 A. D., he may not have reached his fortieth year, when, misunderstood and abandoned by his disciples, distrusted and feared by the common people whose cause he had espoused, scorned and hated by the representatives of every popular form of religion, and condemned as a blasphemer by the highest court of his nation, he paid the penalty for spiritual independence by a cruel and ignominious death.

[1] *Spezieller Kanon der Sonnen und Mondfinsternisse*, 1899, p. 200.

CHAPTER XI

THE TEACHING OF JESUS

It is a significant fact that none of the historic creeds of Christendom devotes any attention to the great ideas that occupied the mind of Jesus. The framers of these venerable statements of Christian belief were deeply concerned about philosophical questions, important in their way, which were wholly foreign to the thought of Jesus, and laid heavy stress upon theological notions that had received no emphasis in his teaching. Their thoughts were not like his thoughts. The so-called Apostles' Creed begins by affirming the faith of the Church in "God the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." This "God the Father" is not the Heavenly Father whose impartial love for all his children, the sons of men, Jesus proclaimed; it is the first of three divine persons, whose distinction from "his Son" lies in his being the source of all creation. Jesus no doubt believed that God had created heaven and earth, but that was not his message to men. Concerning himself the Creed goes on to affirm that he was the "only begotten Son," "conceived by the Holy Ghost," and "born of the Virgin Mary," ideas never expressed by him, and probably altogether unintelligible to him. Concerning his manner of life, his spirit, his convictions on moral and religious questions, his conflict with popular Judaism, his work as a physician and as a reformer, the words and deeds by which he exercised his influence upon the world, this creed has nothing to say. It passes by his life to dwell upon his death, descent to hell, resurrection, ascension, and expected return to judge the quick and the dead. There is not the slightest hint in the Synoptic Gospels that Jesus ever spoke about descend-

ing to hell or ascending to heaven, and it is recognized by critical students that there is not sufficient evidence to warrant the assumption that he prophesied his resurrection on the third day and his return as a judge. Jesus no doubt believed that a holy spirit was sent out by God through which prophets spoke and wrought mighty deeds; but it is quite certain that he had never heard of "the Holy Ghost," the third person of the Trinity. He probably neither hoped for nor feared the development of a "Holy Catholic Church." "The communion of the saints," which originally meant the worship of the departed saints, though not unknown among Hellenistic Jews, is never mentioned by Jesus, and is not likely to have been practiced by him. There are unmistakable indications that he did not believe in a general resurrection on the last day, or in a restoration of the flesh. The later creeds, Catholic or Protestant, whether dealing with the Trinity, the person, natures, will and work of Christ, the eternal decrees, the plan of salvation, or the perdition sure to overtake all unbelievers, are equally silent on the moral and religious issues that caused him to raise his voice, and still more explicit in the statement of doctrines unknown to him, or disapproved by him.

To some extent the New Testament is itself responsible for this shifting of the interest from the message to the messenger, from the ethical to the metaphysical. Already in the Synoptics, but especially in the Fourth Gospel and the Epistles, the personality of Jesus has become the object of a reverent speculation that crowds his teaching into the background. A reader not accustomed to compare texts, eliminate interpolations, sift evidence, or test the value of translations, might readily gain the impression from late additions to the Synoptic gospels, or early misinterpretations by the authors of these works, that Jesus on some occasions placed himself far above his fellow-men, and demanded of them the obedience of slaves to their master, or of subjects to their king. The ecclesiastical tradition that made the Fourth Gospel a work

of the apostle John almost inevitably led persons who failed to observe or appreciate its marked contrast with the Synoptic representation to the conviction that Jesus directed attention to himself, and declared it essential to salvation to have a knowledge of his personality. The Pauline literature completely ignored the earthly life and the teaching of Jesus, finding the power of salvation in the mystic union between the believer and that celestial being who, though crucified, was the Christ, and had been proclaimed as such by resurrection from the dead. The influence for good that found its way through this doctrinal development, begun in the New Testament and continued in the period of the crystallization of dogma, admits of no question. But as the mythical and legendary conceptions that once were so necessary and useful loose their hold upon men, interest returns with increased momentum to the actual thought of Jesus.

The teaching of Jesus revolved about two focal points: the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Father in Heaven. He never seems to have given a definition of the kingdom of heaven, and his conception can only be inferred from the manner in which he speaks of it in parables and detached sayings, and the relation it seems to have had to his general teaching on moral questions. An additional difficulty arises from the fact that there often is much uncertainty as to the accuracy and even the meaning of the Greek translations of his sayings. Hence some of the most fundamental questions are still under debate. Did he conceive of the kingdom of heaven as belonging to the future, or as a present reality? Did he regard it as an institution existing in heaven, or one to be established on the earth? Did he use the term to designate an organized state, or a dominating influence? Did he look for its establishment suddenly and miraculously, or expect its coming gradually by the spread of the truth and the growth of righteousness? Though these questions are closely allied, the answer to one does not necessarily determine the replies to the others, and though the alterna-

tives are sharply marked, the acceptance of one does not necessarily preclude the recognition of a certain element of truth in the other. Thus the interpreter who realizes that the kingdom of heaven is likely to be an eschatological magnitude is naturally inclined to view it as a world-empire to be established on earth suddenly and miraculously by the power of God. On the other hand, the scholar who recognizes the inevitable retouching of any words of Jesus on this subject in view of the current apocalyptic ideas, and deems it probable that the kingdom of heaven was to Jesus a present reality, is easily led to the opinion that the Galilean prophet only looked forward to the gradual recognition among men of his doctrine, and the increasing harmony of earth's life with the conditions prevailing in heaven.

But the ideal that presented itself to Jesus may have been recognized by him as essentially belonging to the future, and yet in process of realization in his own time. He may have regarded it as existing, not only in the thought and purpose of God, but in the heavenly society of angels and men accounted worthy of being raised from the dead to an angel-like existence, and yet to be destined also to appear among men on earth. He may have expected the kingdom of heaven in its full-grown power to be a social organization taking the place of the kingdoms founded by men on principles which he condemned, and yet have looked upon the dominating influence of God in the lives of individual men as an evidence of its presence in the world, and an earnest of its complete manifestation. And he may have wistfully gazed into the future for signs of some impending judgment on his people, some great political revolution, some mighty upheaval among the nations, ushering in tremendous changes in the life of man, and may have firmly believed, as did the prophets before him, that such sudden, awe-inspiring and marvelous events were the work of God bringing about his own holy purposes, without committing himself on this account to the view that the world was coming to an end, and that

God would by a miracle cause a new world to spring into existence, with new conditions wholly unrelated to the old ones. The *a priori* notion that he must have given to this term the meaning likely to have been attached to it in circles affected by apocalyptic writings is as unwarranted as the *a priori* notion that, when he used it, he must have had in mind either heaven above or the Church below.

It is clearly necessary to examine philologically the term that Jesus is likely to have employed, and to take note of its meaning in the Jewish literature of the period; but the manner in which he used it himself, as shown by a critically investigated text, is alone decisive. The Aramaic *malkut dishemayya* means "the reign of heaven." As "heaven" was an exceedingly common substitute for "God" at a time when the Jews avoided the use of any divine name, the term is equivalent to "reign of God," as it was also understood by the later evangelists. There is no clear instance where *malkut* means "kingdom" in the sense of a geographical "realm" or "territory," or of a "body politic" viewed from the standpoint of the citizens composing it. But it is sometimes used more abstractly for "reign," "régime," "royal power," sometimes more concretely for "government," "monarchy," "empire." Thus the Roman empire is often referred to as *malkuta.* In the book of Daniel the term denotes the world-empire which passes from the Chaldaeans to the Medes, the Persians, the Greeks, and finally the Jews. Something more than the supreme authority over the nations is suggested. The expectation is of an organized Jewish empire in the form of a theocracy. The term "theocracy," employed by Josephus to describe the political organization of the Jewish commonwealth, is probably a translation of *malkut dishemayya.* Dalman[1] has adduced ample evidence from Jewish literature of the use of this term to designate the present authority of God over the lives of men. It is a question, however, whether

[1] *Die Worte Jesu,* 1898, p. 75 ff.

the great bulk of his proof-texts, quoted from works later than the fall of Jerusalem and the dispersion of the people, may not represent a modification of the earlier conception. It would be in harmony with the general development of Israel's religious life, if the eschatological and political character of the kingdom of heaven, still so marked in the book of Daniel, should have gradually given place to a more spiritual conception, emphasizing the present rule of the divine law-giver. In the time of Jesus both of these ideas may have been suggested by the expression.

There can be no manner of doubt that to the mind of Jesus the kingdom of heaven was in a large measure a fact belonging to the future. Jesus was a prophet. His eyes were eagerly looking for the things that were to come. This was no mere idle speculation. Present conditions did not satisfy him. He could not believe in the Heavenly Father without believing with all his heart that he had better things in store for men. He watched with profound interest the signs of the times, and deemed it the duty of all men to do so. It was a vital question with him what God was going to do in the world. The more painfully he was affected by the hunger and nakedness, the physical ailments and mental diseases, the ignorance and servitude, the worry and want of faith, the hatred, lust and greed of men, the more ardently he hoped for a better state of things, and the more earnestly he searched for the disposition of heart and the principles of conduct that would prevail in an ideal society. To find this ideal and to hold it against the world appeared to him the most commanding duty and the highest privilege. The kingdom of heaven was to him the *summum bonum*. It was worth the while to live and suffer and die for it. Hence his first recorded utterance[1] and his last[2] referred to its coming. Hence he called those blessed who would see it. Hence he proclaimed its advent as good news to the poor, the suf-

[1] *Matth.*, iv, 17.
[2] *Luke*, xxii, 18.

fering, the socially ostracized. Hence he described, in matchless parables, its supreme worth and the joy of seeking and striving for it. He made it perfectly clear that the coming of the kingdom of heaven would mean a judgment on all that was high and exalted among men, all that was artificial and untrue, all that was built on the sand; but his moral earnestness did not exhaust itself in a cry of doom, as the prophetic messages of Amos and Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah and John the Baptist had. His was the voice of one crying in the wilderness: "Comfort ye my people; prepare ye a highway for the Lord!"

With all this, Jesus did not picture in detail the ideal that stood before him. He did not describe the fertility of the soil, the clothing of the wilderness with all manner of trees, the plenty of oil and corn and must, the joy of sitting under one's own vine and fig-tree, the freedom from political oppression, the submission of the Gentiles to the yoke of the Law, the passing of the empire to the people of the Most High, as post-exilic prophets had done. Some of these things he did not expect, and some he did not consider it worth the while to dwell upon. There were other things, and far more important, that fascinated him in his view of the future, and these he proclaimed with no uncertain sound. It was the righteous life of the new social order that attracted him. The man who spent so much of his time in healing the sick, relieving the needy, and bringing the joy of fellowship to the outcast was not indifferent to the physical environment and the social conditions. But he realized that, if men would first seek the kingdom of God and its righteousness, all these things would be added unto them.[1] It was his conviction that the reign of God would produce a higher type of righteousness, and that this would produce a good and desirable life for man on the earth. In thus seeking for righteousness above everything else and in holding up his own ideal of righteousness against the views prevailing in his social *milieu*, he was the son of the prophets

[1] *Matth.*, vi, 33; *Luke*, xii, 31.

whose denunciation of wrong-doing had made them the spiritual factors in the nation's life, and a true son of Israel whose sense of duty had produced such a prophetic order.

His ideal of righteousness differed in several respects from that prevalent among men who were generally regarded as paragons of piety and exemplars of virtue in Israel. Most important was his contention that a truly righteous character was not the sum of outward acts regarded as righteous. On the contrary, it was the righteous disposition that made the act valuable. "Make the tree good, and its fruits will be good."[1] "If the fountain is good, all the water that flows from it will be sweet." The important thing to Jesus was that a man should be moved inwardly by love of God and love of fellow-man. From this correct inner attitude of mind would then radiate the words and deeds and helpful influences of a good life. The demand for such a righteous inner disposition was not new either in Israel or in the world. Among the introspective Hindus and the clear thinking Greeks it had often been expressed; it was emphasized in the widespread philosophy of the Stoics; in later Jewish literature it had found increasing recognition. But in the thought of Jesus it dominated in a peculiar manner, and led to a break with the established forms of religion at a point where it could become of epoch-making significance for the Western world. If conformity to an external standard, obedience in outward form to the rules laid down in the Law, or by competent authority interpreting the Law, was not to constitute an act as good, but the character of the act was to be determined by the inner disposition, the knowledge of what is true and right must likewise be derived, not from an external authority, but from the inner light. Jesus accepted this consequence, and insisted that the inner eye must be sound and responsive to the direct illumination of the divine, that men must

[1] *Matth.*, vii, 17 ff.; *Luke*, vi, 43 ff.

judge of themselves what is right.[1] It was by heroically throwing himself upon this inner source and sanction of truth that Jesus gained his marvelous confidence, and was led to an open breach with the current ethico-religious ideal as it expressed itself in overt acts.

The common idea of his time, based on the law and the natural inferences from its enactments, was that human society could not exist, or develop profitably, without the killing of enemies, retaliation in kind, condemnation of men, oath-taking, royalty, slavery, divorce, usury and private capital. None of these things had a place in the society for whose coming Jesus lived and died. There would be no wars under the new régime. For war is possible only where men are willing to kill their real or supposed enemies. It cannot be carried on where men, following their own judgment, refuse to obey any man's order to kill indiscriminately the citizens of another country for honor or conquest or to revenge a slight, and where men cultivate a manly spirit of self-control, forbearance, patience, consideration and magnanimity toward real enemies. Jesus was convinced that in the better society to come, men would love their enemies, and seek to overcome their evil disposition by kindliness and active work for their welfare. This would, of course, preclude the barbarity of war as completely as the outgrown barbarity of cannibalism.

The penal code of the Hebrews was based on the principle of retaliation. Like the Code of Hammurabi, the Mosaic Codes prescribed that an eye should be taken for an eye, a tooth for a tooth,[2] a life for a life.[3] The harshness of this legal enactment was often relieved in civilized countries by a provision for monetary restitution. Jesus, however, attacked the principle itself as out of harmony with his idea of justice. His criticism was that this legal measure did not serve any purpose of correction, did not

[1] *Matth.*, vi, 22 ff.
[2] *Leviticus*, xxiv, 20.
[3] *Lev.*, xxiv, 18.

reach the root of the evil, did not change an unrighteous into a righteous life. In his judgment that could be accomplished only by destroying the evil in the man by bringing good, wholesome, kindly influences to bear upon his character. It is evident that, if Jesus had meant to restrict the operation of his superior principle to such wrongs as the courts take no cognizance of, while approving the *lex talionis* as applied by the courts, he would not have selected for his distinct rejection a statement in the Law that, as everybody knew, had no reference to private revenge, but to judicial action. As if to prevent any minimizing of the import of his utterance, he added that every condemnatory judgment was out of harmony with his ideal of the method of dealing with evil-doers. Jesus could find no place in the new society for so-called punitive justice, by which one deed of violence is punished by another deed of violence, but only for such corrective measures as aim at the same time to the reclaiming of the evil-doer and the protection of the innocent.

Jesus did not regard the oath as necessary to society. He had observed the natural tendency of oath-taking to invalidate the obligation or veracity in statements not sworn to. But his chief objection seems to have been its lack of modesty. A creature who cannot add a cubit to his stature, and does not know what the morrow will bring, impotent and ignorant both as to his own nature and in regard to the future that lies before him, assumes to swear by the ever-living God—for all oaths, however worded, are essentially oaths by God—that he will do this or that! The Law sanctioned swearing when the oath was kept, but made perjury a crime.[1] Jesus said: "Swear not!" "Tell the truth!" The Church, less confident in the potency and safety of just telling the truth, was glad to learn from her scribes that Jesus probably had in mind only some ill-sounding curse-words and asseverations that too easily fall from the lips of Orientals in the rush of conversation, not an oath that really had

[1] *Lev.*, xix, 12.

any significance, and she continued to swear. But the probability is against this scholastic construction. If Jesus had meant to impress upon the minds of his disciples such a distinction between private swearing and public swearing, he could not have more completely forgotten to mention the only thing for which he is supposed to have called their attention to the ancient law, or more absolutely have led them away from any thought of a subtle distinction between public and private swearing to the idea that he, like some other teachers, rejected the oath as such. That is what the Essenes seem to have done. Josephus relates that they rejected every oath, and considered the taking of an oath worse than perjury,[1] and that on this account Herod did not demand of them an oath of allegiance, as he did of the Pharisees.[2] In view of this, his statement that at their initiation into the society the members bound themselves with an oath[3] is subject to the same doubt as the similar statement in regard to the Christians in Pliny's letter to Trajan. Neither the Essene nor the Christian brotherhood probably looked upon the ceremony of initiation in the light of an oath.

Jesus looked for a society where there would be no kings or rulers, where no man would exercise authority or lord it over his fellows.[4] This principle rendered it impossible for him to share the common desire for a Messiah. He knew that what the world needed was not a Messiah, a king of the Jews, or an emperor of the nations, but a race of men subject to no man's bidding but eager to serve, and counting him greatest who, with the least desire to impose his authority on men, is able, by humble and faithful service, to exercise the widest influence for good. In one sense Jesus was, therefore, like Plato, a philosophical anarchist. But his anarchy was tempered

[1] *Bellum judaicum*, II, 135.
[2] *Ant.*, xv, 371.
[3] *Bellum judaicum*, II, 139-142.
[4] *Luke*, xxii, 24 ff.

by his theocratic idea. He disbelieved in man's authority over man, because he believed so earnestly in God's authority over man. If he reflected at all upon the need of light and leading for the more and more complicated activities of society, he may have looked for a special prophetic order, or for the endowment of men in every walk of life with the necessary insight and power. That is what every democracy must depend upon. It must have interpreters of the laws of the universe, moral and physical, and men and women who, possessed of extraordinary knowledge and skill, put these to the service of the people. Jesus did not distinctly express his views on the question of slavery. But there is every reason to believe that he shared the views of the Essenes, who had no slaves but were all free, working one for the other.[1] It is certain that there were no slaves in his little society, and his attitude on the subject of authority precludes apparently the possibility of his approving slavery as an institution.

In the future society there would be no divorce, according to the view of Jesus. Marriage would be entered only by some men and women for the propagation of the race, and be absolutely indissoluble, except by death.[2] He seems to have regarded married life as a condition proper for a certain class in society from which those physically unfit for the sexual function should be naturally excluded, and from which others, following his own example, might profitably exclude themselves for the sake of the kingdom of heaven,[3] in order to serve its interests and to realize in their own lives the strictest demands of its righteousness.

[1] Philo, II, 457; Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii, 21.

[2] This is clear from *Mark*, x, 11, 12. In *Matth.*, v, 32, and xix, 9, "save for the cause of adultery" has been added. The addition is already found in the Sinaitic Syriac; but, weighty as this testimony always is, it cannot prove that the phrase was an original part of the saying of Jesus. Mark could have no motive in leaving it out; but the motive for adding it is obvious.

[3] *Matth.* xix, 11, 12.

The Jew was forbidden by the Law from practising usury on Jews but permitted to charge interest on his loans to Gentiles.[1] The result was that many a well-to-do son of Abraham refused to relieve by a loan the distress of his fellow countryman, while he was quite ready to accommodate a Gentile who had good securities, and to charge such interest as he could get in view of all the circumstances. Thus the often accidental and unmerited possession of money gave a power over another man's life apt to increase and to rob him of his independence. Jesus could not conceive of this fruitful source of enmity continuing under the new régime. Men would not hold back the needed loan,[2] unless they could make profit out of the necessities of their brothers. In fact, he deemed the heaping up of vast private fortunes as an evil destined to pass away with the coming of the kingdom of heaven. He could not harmonize with his ideal of social righteousness the co-existence of great wealth in the hands of few and great destitution prevailing among the many. The principle of a man getting for himself all that he can seemed to him wrong, and he desired to see it superseded by the principle of sharing. He appears to have reached his conclusions on this point, not only through the impression of unjust inequalities, but even more by observation of the evil effect upon character of wealth thus held. How far he had given any thought to the manner in which a better method of distribution could be developed, is difficult to say. He felt that only the principle of sharing with others could bring about a society in which the extremes of wealth and poverty should no longer exist.

There can be no doubt that Jesus expected the full operation of these principles only in the new social order or theocracy which he designated as the kingdom of heaven. But it would be quite unwarranted to infer from this, as some have done, that he did not look for their application until "the millennium" should come, and was well aware

[1] *Deuteronomy*, xxiii, 19, 20.

[2] *Matth.*, vi, 42.

that they were impracticable under present circumstances.

The arguments adduced to prove that he did not regard them as obligatory even upon himself, or that he did not give them the radical sense they seem to bear on the surface, are for the most part of a trivial nature. It is said that he cannot have believed in the overcoming of evil with good on all occasions, as he drove the money-changers from the temple,[1] and once commanded his disciples to sell all that they had and buy swords.[2] On the former occasion he may indeed have given way to a passion of anger, and it is by no means certain that he would have afterwards wished his disciples to follow his example and to defend it, though it should be remembered that there is no element of revenge or of private or official punishment in the act, and that he may have had no aim but correction, and no motive but kindness. The words with which he rebuked Peter for his use of the sword[3] are too plainly condemnatory of all use of the sword to permit the thought that he had ever contemplated a *coup d'état* such as must have been in his mind, if he actually ordered his followers to sell all their possessions and buy swords, or even had thought of the protection of his person against private attacks by killing or maiming his enemies. The evidence seems to show that he was loyal to the end to the convictions he had so clearly expressed. It is furthermore averred that before the high-priest he was willing to be put under oath, even though he did not swear himself. Even Merx, who with great learning has gathered together the evidence that the phrase, "Thou sayest it," is virtually a refusal to answer the question, curiously enough quotes the passage to show that Jesus had no objection to being put under oath.[4] When it is recognized that we have no knowledge of what occurred in the presence of the high-priest, this in itself futile argument must

[1] *Matth.*, xxi, 12 ff. and parallels.
[2] *Luke*, xxii, 36.
[3] *Matth.*, xxvi, 52.
[4] Cf. *Das Evangelium Matthaeus*, 1902, p. 101, and p. 392.

be finally laid aside. The idea that Jesus cannot have been opposed to autocracy, since he claimed for himself royal authority, is based on a misunderstanding of his use of the term "son of man" and on late additions to the gospel.

An approval of usury and of private wealth has been found by many in the parables of the Talents[1] and the Unjust Steward.[2] Did he not say that it was better to put money in a bank and draw interest on it than to bury it in the ground, and that it was still better to try to get an enormous profit from a small outlay? Yes, and did he not say that it was better for a steward to swindle his master and make friends of the debtors by forgeries, in order to secure his own future, than to await the ignominious discovery of his embezzlement, since by such wise use of money it was possible to obtain everlasting life? It should not be necessary to indicate the point of the first parable which passes no judgment on current business methods, least of all contrary to the plain teaching of Jesus without any figure of speech on other occasions, but simply inculcates the necessity of cultivating such powers as a man possesses, since they grow with use and are lost if not used. As for the second, it seems impossible to recover its original form. It is equally difficult to believe that Jesus could ever have looked upon so clumsy a forgery as a wise and praiseworthy expedient, and that he could have commended any wisdom in the use of the unrighteous Mammon, having the faintest resemblance to this, as likely to bring about a happy reunion of friends in the everlasting habitations.

Some scholars have moved in the opposite direction. Instead of regarding the principles laid down in the Sermon on the Mount as applicable, in the judgment of Jesus, only in the future condition of things, they have maintained that he must have formulated them in view of the transitoriness of present conditions, for guidance until the kingdom of heaven should come. Why should his

[1] *Matth.*, xxv, 14 ff.; *Luke*, xix, 11 ff.
[2] *Luke*, xvi, 1 ff.

disciples take vengeance themselves or seek to secure it through courts, bind themselves by oaths, care for places of honor and authority, get married or obtain divorce, keep their possessions or seek to increase them, when the world is so soon to come to an end, and God himself will avenge his own, give them to sit upon thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, and restore to them manifold the things they have abandoned? This view has certain advantages. It does not need to twist the words of Jesus out of their natural meaning, and it puts into relief the eschatological temper that unquestionably existed among the disciples of Jesus, and has found expression in utterances ascribed to him in the Gospels. But it fails to do justice to those sayings of his that prove their genuineness most convincingly by being in contrast with this prevailing apocalyptic mood.

His most characteristic utterances do not indicate a view of the kingdom of heaven that could have led him to share the ordinary hopes for vengeance, power and wealth, when the good time should come, while preaching a temporary ethics of self-renunciation as a preparation for it. The parables of the Sower,[1] the Leaven,[2] and the Mustard-seed[3] bear testimony of a wholly different idea. The ripe corn in the field, and the tree with its fruit-laden branches only reveal the nature of the seed that was sown in the ground. The piece of leaven that was put into the lump has not changed in character by permeating the whole. The old continues side by side with the new until the former finally disappears. This thought is found in the parable of the fishes[4] as well as in that of the leaven. The good and the bad cannot be separated, until at the end of the process the latter are eliminated. The reign of God, at first invisible, like the seed in the earth, becomes gradually manifest in its transforming power, like

[1] *Matth.*, xiii, 1 ff. and parallels.
[2] *Matth.*, xiii, 33.
[3] *Matth.*, xiii, 31, 32.
[4] *Matth.*, xiii, 47 ff.

the plant that puts forth first the stalk, then the blade, and then the ear in the blade.[1] It exists among men before it is seen and recognized as a new social order, and it continues after that to reveal its nature in undreamed beauty of blossom and sweetness of fruitage. It is in harmony with this, when Jesus declares that the kingdom of heaven cometh not with observation, nor shall they say, "Lo, here! or Lo, there! for the kingdom of heaven is within you."[2] If the Aramaic term used by Jesus was *binetiru,* his meaning seems to have been: the kingdom does not come in such a manner that men may lie in wait and watch for its appearance, and say, "Here it is," or "There it is." If he said *begawwekon,* it can only have meant "within you." But even if he said *benekon,* "among you," the context makes it abundantly plain that he meant that it was among men in such a manner that it could not be seen and located, but existed as an inner reality, in their lives.[3]

It is not by leveling down the ethical demands of Jesus to the conventional ideas of any age, nor by construing them as temporary counsels of perfection, by which a handful of men might be prepared for a presently expected end of the world, that we gain a conception of the real grandeur of that ideal which fired his soul with enthusiasm, and made his life what it was. When it is said that his ideal of a better social order is an idle dream, and that his type of righteousness is impracticable under such conditions as prevail in the world, two facts are overlooked. No dream of social righteousness can justly be regarded as idle that has contributed so much to the moral progress of the world as this hope of the growing kingdom of heaven on earth has already done. And before it is pronounced impracticable, an application of its

[1] *Mark,* iv, 26-29.

[2] *Luke,* xvii, 20, 21.

[3] This passage is well treated in Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu,* 1898, p. 116 ff.

fundamental principles should be tried on a larger scale than has hitherto been the case.

Jesus does not seem to have defined his conception of the Father in heaven in any other way than he defined his idea of the kingdom of heaven. Chiefly by parables to the multitudes, and by short pithy sayings to his disciples, he intimated what he thought concerning God, man's relation to him, and the proper manner of serving him. His language, when speaking of these subjects, is simple and unconventional, yet of great dignity and beauty. There are abundant signs of deep and independent thinking, but no traces of familiarity with the terminology of the philosophical schools or with the questions discussed by them. The idea of the fatherhood of God, even in an ethical sense, existed long before the time of Jesus, and had found fine expression in later Jewish literature. The mind of Jesus seems to have dwelt on its natural implications. As in the case of man his great concern was about the rectitude of the inner disposition, so in the case of God the question of his moral attitude occupied him most. He did not doubt his unity, eternity, omniscience and omnipotence. But was he the Perfect Being in whom his ideal of rectitude, truth within and adequate manifestation, justice and love in inseparable union, was absolute reality? In our ignorance of the early life of Jesus, we cannot deny that there may have been a period of storm and stress when this question agitated his soul, as it had once racked the mind of the author of Job. There are in his teaching those frank admissions, those resolute retrenchments, those bold deviations from current views, that generally betoken conflict as well as reflection. Was it without disenchantment he observed for the first time how the wicked man's field flourished, while the parched ground of some God-fearing widow refused to yield bread for her starving little ones? Could he always behold without flinching how some mighty tower buried beneath its falling mass righteous men and innocent children, and how the life of some rich hypocrite

passed on peacefully to its end without accidents to terrify or bereavements to make sad? However that may have been, in his public ministry he is animated by a faith not in need of blinking the facts of existence that belie the current doctrine of retribution, because it rests upon the perception of a higher law of compensation.

In his parables of the Lost Coin,[1] the Lost Sheep,[2] and the Lost Son,[3] Jesus expressed most clearly his conviction that active love is the world-conquering and world-transforming power. There is nothing so insignificant, there is nothing so bad, that Divine Love does not care for it and cannot redeem it. The impartiality with which the sun shines and the rain falls is not a sign of indifference to moral cosmic ends, but only an indication that the impartial Divine Love pursues these ends without necessary regard to the imperfect system of rewards and punishments with which human justice seeks to operate. It is more conducive to the moral perfection of the human race to let the sun shine and the rain fall without discrimination according to human merit and demerit than it would be to allow the sun to shine and the rain to fall only on the good man's field. No system of external rewards and punishments can make men righteous.[4] The actual divine method works for righteousness. It is intrinsically right, not only in view of the ultimate product, but also at every point of its administration. For the law of cause and effect operates unceasingly. In spite of appearances, the divine book-keeping is very exact. The good rewards itself, and the evil is its own punishment; the effect inheres in the act and engenders a retribution that is never unjust or unmerciful. The man who prays in public and is seen of men has his reward.[5] He who gains

[1] *Luke*, xv, 8-10.
[2] *Luke*, xv, 3-7.
[3] *Luke*, xv, 11 ff.
[4] Cf. *Luke*, xvii, 10. The parable of the workers in the vineyard, *Matth.*, xx, 1-16, also shows this connection of life and work, not dominated by the ordinary ideas of retribution.
[5] *Matth.*, vi, 5.

the world is rewarded by what he gains. Had he sought a good character or spiritual joy, these would have been his. His loss is not less real, because he fails to appreciate that of which he has deprived himself.

This view rendered it possible for Jesus to conceive of the Heavenly Father as continuing to be the God of those who by his power are raised from the dead, while allowing others to return to their dust without a resurrection.[1] This was no arbitrary act of God. In those fit to survive the life-giving power of God appropriated by living in harmony with his supreme law of love brought about its own result; as long as they were living his love sought the lost children.

Jesus regarded God as the Father, not only of the Jews, but of the Samaritans and the Gentiles also, not only of the good but of the bad as well. That the Israelites were the sons and daughters of their God, was a common notion. Hence the members of the nation were regarded as brothers, having one father, namely, God. The parable of the Good Samaritan[2] teaches that a member of this despised people is a brother since he shows a brother's spirit, and acts as a son of God should. Jesus took pains to emphasize the fatherly care of God for members of other nations.[3] His parable of the Vineyard[4] indicates that he feared the overthrow of the Jewish theocracy and looked forward to the establishment of the intimate relation that it involved between God and a people living according to the principles of righteousness in which he believed. While he knew that God always acted as a father toward all men, he also realized that his children both in Israel and among the other nations did not always act as sons of

[1] *Luke,* xx, 27-40. "For all live to him" has been recognized by many scholars to be a late addition.

[2] *Luke,* x, 29-37.

[3] *Luke,* iv, 25-27, no doubt represents an actual saying of Jesus, though Luke has placed it out of its true chronological position.

Matth., xxi, 33 ff.; *Mark,* xii, 1 ff.; *Luke,* xx, 9 ff. It has been retouched in all recensions, but no doubt goes back in its original form to Jesus.

God. "If ye who are evil," he said, "know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall the Father in heaven give good things to those who ask."[1] God cares for his children, though they are evil, better than they ever care for their offspring. They should therefore seek to be perfect, as their Father in heaven is perfect.[2] No honor can be greater than to be called sons of God. But he did not single out any class of men, for instance his own disciples, as worthy of this title. Still less did he suggest that they should call themselves sons of God, or children of God, in distinction from their fellow-men. Such a spirit of self-laudation he condemned in the parable of the Publican and the Pharisee.[3] Least of all did he think of applying it to himself exclusively. The notion that he called himself "the Son of God," and spoke of God as "my Father" in distinction from "your Father," is based on manifestly late additions to the Synoptic gospels, and free and misleading translations into Greek of the original, which did not use the possessive pronouns. Nevertheless, it is certain that Jesus derived both comfort and confidence from the thought that he was a child of the Father in heaven, an object of his love and care, an agent for the spread of his truth, a herald of his coming kingdom, an interpreter of his holy will, a man earnestly endeavoring to live as a son of God.

Jesus broke with the popular religious cult in regard to sacrifices, sabbath-keeping, sacred washings, and the distinctions between clean and unclean meat. He also turned his criticism against such important matters as public prayer, fasting and almsgiving in which piety was especially wont to express itself. His fundamental objection to public prayer was that it was offered in the wrong place. Prayer, in his opinion, should be offered in the closet where the fact that a man was praying could not be

[1] *Matth.*, vii, 11.
[2] *Matth.*, v, 48.
[3] *Luke*, xviii, 9-14.

observed by men.[1] The results of such private communion with God where there was no temptation to contemplate the effect upon listening human ears, or to spin out long addresses, would be manifest in the daily life. But he felt that a truly reverent soul must shrink from laying bare its deepest experiences and most urgent needs in the embarrassing presence of men. It seemed to him immodest and conducive to untruth and conventionality. History abundantly proves that he was right in this contention. When men pray publicly, there is a decided tendency to make long speeches, to emphasize a thought by repetition or slight variation, and to frame the address with a view to its effect upon the audience. Seeing the irresistible force of this tendency, Jesus counseled his disciples not to pray in public, and fearing the effect of long habit on their private devotions, he warned them not to use many words, since the Father in heaven knew all their needs. The church has paid little or no attention to his advice, but has vied with the heathen nations both in regard to the publicity and the length of the prescribed prayers.

The fact that Jesus and his disciples did not fast aroused unfavorable criticism. His remarks about the new piece and the old garment and the new wine and the old wine-skins[2] show how utterly foreign to his conception of religion this exercise was. In the Sermon on the Mount he advised his disciples to anoint their heads and wash their faces when they fasted so as not to be seen fasting by men.[3] Sack-cloth and ashes were the regular accompaniments of fasting. The appearance of a man in society dressed as for a festival, with face washed and head anointed was quite incongruous with his observing a fast. It would indeed be difficult for him to abstain from food without being seen of men to fast. Men fasted in order to show publicly their sorrow, humility and re-

[1] *Matth.*, vi, 5-8.
[2] *Matth.*, ix, 16, 17.
[3] *Matth.*, vi, 16-18.

pentance. Jesus seems to have objected to the custom on two grounds. A public display of humility and contrition appeared to him immodest and absurd, inasmuch as humility is already gone when it is professed, and repentance has not yet been born until it manifests itself in righteous conduct. Then a man should seek to bear his own burden patiently and calmly, without betraying its weight to others who have theirs, and rather add his daily contribution to the common fund of joy and contentment by which all are sustained. The larger branches of the Church have continued the custom, without the slightest regard to the warning of Jesus, while some of the Protestand denominations have abandoned the practice but not without inventing new forms for the public display of contrition and sorrow for sin.

The Hebrew word for "justice" became in later Judaism a technical term for "almsgiving." This was not a backward step. It was the addition to a noble word of a still finer meaning, the supplementing of the idea of righteousness by the element of active sympathy. Giving to the poor became a part of religion. It was felt to be a lending to the Lord, a support of his cause who was the friend of the poor and the needy, the widow and the orphan. A number of causes helped to make it one of the most popular religious functions. That God was served by the relieving of suffering fellow-men, was an idea appealing to the noblest instincts in man. The value of this service could be easily seen, and the consciousness of doing an unmistakably good deed was comforting. Then there was the pleasure of acting as a human Providence, of receiving gratitude, of being called benefactors, of enjoying popularity, of being gladly seen and enthusiastically greeted by men, of exercising a power over them apparently not based on violence, of having a good reputation and comparative immunity from the criticism to which obvious selfishness is always exposed. Besides, there was the conviction that it is profitable to lend unto the Lord who pays a generous interest.

Jesus strongly believed in the principle of sharing with the needy. But he desired the abolition of poverty by such a distribution of wealth as would leave no disproportionate fortunes in private hands. As he realized that a great obstacle to such an equitable distribution was the doling out of alms publicly in the name of religion by men who had no scruples as to the methods by which they gained their wealth and, in spite of their alms-giving, continued to hold on to and increase their large fortunes, he directed his attack against the public bestowal of charity, the giving of money to the Lord in such a manner as to be seen of men.[1] He seems to have looked upon the relieving of a brother's need in public as indecent. That a brother was permitted to suffer appeared to his mind as a matter to be ashamed of, a condition to be silently and quietly corrected. That a man should hold in his hands the ransom of a thousand lives, and seek to be known by men when out of his abundance he threw some crumbs to his starving brothers, seemed to him equally abnormal. The Church has too often failed to take this ground and encouraged rather than rebuked ostentatious giving to the Lord.

A critical study of the records has shown with increasing clearness that Jesus had no sympathy with the idea of saving men's souls by sacramental magic. Whether weight is given to literary and historical considerations, or attention is limited solely to the restoration of the original text, it becomes certain that Jesus did not command his disciples to baptize the nations. It is equally evident that he did not institute any Supper in remembrance of him. The idea of salvation through any cermony was utterly foreign to his mind. Nor is there the slightest indication that he believed in salvation through human sacrifice or human merits. He never taught that God needed the blood of the Messiah, or his own blood, to satisfy his justice and to enable him to pardon the sins of men. On the contrary, he distinctly taught men to rely

[1] *Matth.*, vi, 1-4.

upon God's forgiveness, if they were themselves willing to forgive,[1] and to assure others of God's forgiveness without any suggestion of a vicarious payment of their debts through blood.[2] Nor did he connect salvation with membership either in the holy nation or in an organized body of believers. To inherit eternal life man must obey the great commandments of the Law,[3] love God and men; he must lose his life in humble, faithful, loving service in order to find it. That is his doctrine of salvation. A Samaritan or a Gentile may thus be saved from selfishness as well as a Jew. Nor did Jesus connect salvation in any way with belief in himself. There is no teaching of Jesus concerning his own person to be gleaned by a careful historian from the records of his life. What he thought about himself is reflected in what he taught concerning man, his duties and his privileges, his relation to the Father in heaven and his future destiny.[4]

[1] *Matth.*, vi, 14.

[2] *Matth.*, i, 6.

[3] *Matth.*, xix, 18 ff.

[4] The insight of genius and the sympathy of spiritual kinship often travel faster than scientific research, with its cumbersome critical apparatus and its exacting method. Leo Tolstoi perceives the thought of Jesus more clearly than the majority of exegetes. Among trained theologians, Nathan Söderblom has a keen sense of the larger bearings of the moral ideas of Jesus (*Jesu Bärgspredikan*, 1899). Wellhausen understands that Jesus was a prophet, and has described, with fine appreciation, his religious message (*Israelitische und Jüdische Geschichte*, 3d ed. 1897, p. 374). He fails, however, to do equal justice of the ethical teachings of Jesus. From his otherwise so admirable sketch one would not know that Jesus had taken a definite stand against the killing of enemies, the legal principle of punitive justice to the ethical teachings of Jesus. From his otherwise so admira- autocracy, and the accumulation of private wealth. Yet the attitude of Jesus upon these vital questions is likely to interest thoughtful men quite as much as his theological views.

CHAPTER XII

THE HISTORIC INFLUENCE OF JESUS

During his life Jesus exerted a powerful influence upon those who came into contact with him through his teaching, his works and his spirit. Men were attracted by the beauty and originality of his speech; they were held by the grandeur and nobility of his thought. He spoke with the authority of a prophet, and his message concerned that kingdom of heaven for whose coming men in Israel eagerly looked. His manner of life strengthened the impression of his words. The cures he wrought spread his fame abroad. Yet he laid up no treasures for himself. What he had he generously shared with the poor. Men were accustomed to associate such moral earnestness and sincere piety as he showed with ascetic habits and a zeal for legal observances. A man who drank wine with tax-gatherers and conversed with harlots, defended sabbath-breaking and neglected sacred ablutions, while he criticised the law of Moses for not teaching a sufficiently high type of righteousness, and exemplified in his conduct the moral principles he taught, could not fail to be observed by many eyes. But more than anything he said or did, it was the charm of his personality that drew men to him. Whether they understood his words or not, whether they were able to share his view of life or not, whether they followed him a day or a year, they could not escape from his spirit. His disciples left him and fled on the last night of his life. But his tragic death impressed them perchance as deeply as the women who stood afar off and heard his death-cry. "Those who loved him at the first did not cease to love him."[1] He had been their

[1] Josephus, *Ant.*, xviii, 64. The passage is spurious, but the sentiment is true.

leader while he lived. He continued to occupy their thoughts and to be the directing force in their lives after he was dead.

The spell of his spirit was upon his disciples. His aphorisms, his parables, his answers to captious questions, could not be forgotten. The horrors of his death could not efface the memories of his life. They clustered about the hills of Galilee and its blue lake. Here he had spoken, with manly courage to those in high station, with gentle sympathy to earth's little ones, proclaiming good tidings to the poor. Here he had lived his simple and unselfish life, healing the sick, helping the needy, comforting the sad of heart, befriending the outcast, and bringing very near to all the kingdom of their hope. Here they had walked with him and cherished in secret the conviction that it was he who should redeem Israel. How far it would have been possible for such a purely spiritual impression to maintain itself and to transmit to later generations an attitude of loyalty to him and to his cause, is a question that cannot be answered. If Jesus had lived in the days of Jeremiah, his disciples would not have looked for his return upon the clouds of heaven, or believed that he had been raised from the dead, since the necessary conditions, the hope of a Messiah and the doctrine of a resurrection, did not then exist. But the fall of Jerusalem would have been likely to bring his words to honor, center the interest on his personality, produce a more or less reliable biography, and give him a place of equal honor at least with the prophet of Anathoth.

A wider influence was unquestionably secured for Jesus through the expectation that he would soon return to earth as the Messiah, and the belief that he had been raised to life again on the third day after his death. Early Christian literature shows how general and intense was the hope of his coming to overthrow the Roman empire and to establish the kingdom of heaven. There is every reason to believe that the immediate disciples of Jesus expected this even to occur in their own generation.

Already in his life-time they had looked forward to a day when he should show himself to Israel as the Messiah. At first his death would naturally seem to put a barrier against the realization of this hope. But in large and influential Jewish circles death was no longer looked upon as the end of sentient and self-conscious life. The Persian doctrine of a resurrection had been introduced, and the land beyond the grave had been mapped out and become familiar ground. As the raising of the dead was not yet ascribed to the Messiah, and not universally conceived of as occurring on the last day, this act of God's power might be looked for whenever circumstances seemed to warrant it. Thus Herod Antipas is said to have feared that Jesus was none else than John the Baptist raised from the dead.[1] At Caesarea Philippi the disciples report that many regarded Jesus as John the Baptist, Elijah, Jeremiah or some other prophet returned to life again.[2] It is not strange therefore that the belief should have grown up that Jesus himself had been raised from the dead. The emphasis placed in early Christian writings upon the statement that his resurrection was "according to the Scriptures"[3] shows the influence of supposed Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament in shaping this doctrine.[4]

[1] *Matth.*, xiv, 1, 2; *Mark*, vi, 14-16; in *Luke*, ix, 7-9, Herod only wonders who Jesus is, while some of his suite regard him as John the Baptist.

[2] *Matth.*, xvi, 14; *Mark*, viii, 28 (Jeremiah omitted); *Luke*, ix, 19 (Jeremiah omitted). Cf. also *Mark*, vi, 15; *Luke*, ix, 8. The story in *Matth.*, xxvii, 52, 53, according to which many saints were raised, came forth from their tombs, entered the holy city and appeared to many at the time of Jesus' death, shows not less clearly how little the thought of a resurrection was restricted to the last day. The addition "after his resurrection," made to bring the story into harmony with the doctrine that "Christ was raised from the dead as the first-fruits of those that are asleep" (I *Cor.*, xv, 20), is lacking in the *Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*. This seems to have been generally overlooked.

[3] I *Cor.*, xv, 4; *Acts*, ii, 25 ff.; xiii, 34 ff.; *John*, xx, 9; *Luke*, xxiv, 46.

[4] *Ps.*, xvi, 8-11, is directly quoted. If "he will not suffer his holy one to see corruption" was thought to refer to the Messiah, since

From the same source manifestly comes the vacillation between "three days and three nights"[1] and "on the third day."[2] How early the disciples of Jesus became convinced that he had been raised from the dead, cannot be ascertained with certainty. There seems to be no good reason for doubting that the conception goes back to the immediate disciples of Jesus.[3] If Romans i and I Corinthians xv, 1-2, 12 ff. were penned by Paul, the oldest documents referring to the resurrection of Jesus would have been written not more than a quarter of a century after his death.

In spite of the fact that the clouds never bore him back, the followers of the prophet of Nazareth continued to gaze steadfastly into the sky for the sign of the Son of Man. Generations passed and he "delayed his coming"; but faith, scorning repeated disenchantments, drew strength to meet the bitterest persecutions from the sure prophetic word. Only as the fortunes of the Church

David had been allowed to see corruption, it followed of necessity that the Messiah must be raised before the fourth day. For it seems to have been commonly held that corruption set in on the fourth day, when the face changed, and that the soul then took its final leave of the body. Cf. Babylonian Talmud, *Yebamoth*, 20a, and *Bereshith Rabba*, 100; it is also to be observed that Lazarus had been in his tomb four days in *John*, xi, 17. The basis of this idea was undoubtedly the occurrence of reanimation in cases of apparent death. Such figures of speech as "after two days will he revive us, on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him" (*Hosea*, vi, 2), current at a time when the idea of a resurrection was quite unknown in Israel, clearly go back to this physical phenomenon. Three days and three nights would consequently be the utmost limit, if the Messiah were not to "see corruption." *Matth.*, xii, 46, shows that Jonah's sojourn in the belly of the fish exactly that length of time (ii, 1) seemed to some typical of the sojourn of the Messiah in death before his resurrection.

[1] *John*, ii, 19-22; *Matth.*, xii, 40.

[2] I *Cor.*, xv, 4, and other passages. "The third day" is differently understood in *Matth.*, xxviii, 1, where Jesus is already risen "late on the Sabbath day as the first day of the week drew on," *i. e.*, Saturday night, and in the other accounts where this event takes place the next morning.

[3] See *Excursus* C.

changed, did this hope lessen its hold. With the establishment of Christianity as the official religion of the Roman empire men generally ceased to look for an immediate return of Jesus to earth, and for a Messianic kingdom of a thousand years. The term Christ was no longer the equivalent of the Messiah; it meant the Son of God in a metaphysical sense, the eternal Logos, the second person of the Trinity. As God he was omnipresent; he was always near to those who called upon him; in the eucharist was his real presence; the Church was his representative; this Church was the kingdom of God on earth; the kingdom of heaven was a celestial realm whither the faithful member of the Church passed after death to behold his Saviour face to face. Beside this new conception there was no room for the earlier view, and no spiritual demand for it. On the other hand, the belief in the resurrection of Jesus could not be affected by the disillusionings of history or the changed conception of the Christ. That the incarnate God had risen from the dead was less difficult to believe than that he had died at all, and there was no disposition to examine the accounts critically.

The influence of Jesus in the period in which the Christology of the Church was defined by the ecumenic symbols should not be underestimated. The Gospels were widely read, and the strong impression of the human personality of Jesus manifests itself not only in the dissenting bodies that emphasized his humanity, but also in the Catholic Church, whose endeavor it was to vindicate his true humanity as well as his divinity. It was not merely an intellectual curiosity to solve what is at bottom a permanent problem of thought that led to the subtle distinctions between *homoousion* and *homoiousion,* legitimate as this would have been. It was quite as much the personal affection for Jesus inspired by the portrayal of his life and the presentation of his doctrine in the Gospels. With the moral impression of a noble divine personality, who stood as the constant object of worship, fear, confidence

and love, there blended the elevating influence of a human life that inspired and called for imitation. While in the interest of historic truth greater discrimination is needed than is usually found in the claims made for Christianity, the tendency to account for certain social changes on purely economic grounds and to eliminate all spiritual forces is apt to lead astray. The manumission of slaves, or change from slavery to serfhood, in the Roman empire, was no doubt in a large measure due to the diminishing supply of slaves and their consequent increase in value after the empire had reached its greatest territorial extension, as Gibbon and Adam Smith have pointed out; but it would be unjust to forget the moral and religious influences of Stoic philosophy and of Christianity. It was a Stoic, Dio Chrysostomus,[1] who, in the reign of Trajan, first declared that slavery is contrary to the laws of nature. The spirit of Jesus still brooding over his church created a moral disposition that was distinctly favorable to the emancipation of the slaves.[2]

Similarly, the great improvement of sexual morality, showing itself in purer marital relations and in the continence of the monastic life, was to a considerable extent the result of causes not connected with the life or teaching of Jesus. The ebb and flow of physical life in successive generations apparently causes periods of indifference and aversion to pleasure to follow periods of over-indulgence of the appetites. The Church only inherited the Hebrew ideal of chastity, and even the monastic life had one of its roots in Judaism, as the communities of Essenes and Therapeutae[3] testify. Besides, the attitude of the Stoics must be considered. But there can be no question that in

[1] *Opera*, ed. Emperius, xiv, xv, p. 265 ff.

[2] The Deutero Pauline epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians and Philemon recognize the institution of slavery and consequently insist upon the return of fugitive slaves to their masters, but earnestly urge kindly treatment and a fraternal spirit.

[3] With Massebieau, Conybeare, Wendland, Pfleiderer and Bousset, the present writer considers *De vita contemplativa* as a genuine work of Philo.

two directions at least the influence of Jesus was important. He had declared in favor of the indissolubility of marriage, and he had exemplified celibacy in his own life and apparently commended it for the sake of the kingdom of heaven.

The missionary enterprises and crusades that characterize the earlier centuries of the Middle Ages were, at least in part, due to a sincere desire that Jesus as the celestial king should reign over pagans and Muhammadans living in rebellion against him and therefore doomed to perish. If the interests were often those of the Church rather than of Jesus, this distinction was seldom felt by the pious missionary or crusader. That economic causes operated in the background, they never dreamed. They knew the loyalty of their own hearts to their king in heaven, whose law they would impose upon the nations, whose tomb they would rescue from the hands of the infidels, and whose glory they would spread by the words of their mouth or the blows of their sword. It is impossible to recall the names of Columban and Gallus, of Emmeran and Rupert, of Boniface and Ansgar, of Cyril and Methodius, without realizing how truly this missionary zeal could serve the real cause of Jesus. However radically opposed to the spirit of the gentle Nazarene the contest for the empire of the world between Christian Rome and Muhammadan Baghdad may appear, however absurd the combination of a cross on the breast and a sword in the hand, and however lamentable the resultant exclusiveness, prejudice, distrust and unnatural relationship between two great historic religions, it cannot be questioned that the cross very often meant the surrender of worldly ambition, wealth and pleasure, the sacrifice of domestic happiness, the risk of life, the willing acceptance and patient endurance of hardship for the sake of the unseen king. The chivalry of the mediaeval knight from which our modern treatment of woman so largely is derived cannot be regarded as solely a product of Christianity, for it has a deep root in the dreamy reverence for woman char-

acteristic of our pagan ancestors. Yet it would not have become what it was but for the veneration accorded to the Virgin Mary; and though this cult ultimately goes back to the widespread worship of one or another mother goddess in the Roman empire, it was itself informed by the spirit of Jesus. Even the papal contention, that there is a sphere of morals and religion in which the consciences of men ought not to be subjected to the authority of princes or of civil government, reflects a thought of Jesus. Give to Caesar what belongs to Caesar, but also to God what belongs to God. There are diviner rights than those of kings. Unfortunately, papacy itself in its attempt to represent Jesus on earth did not follow his leadership in disentangling itself from all political ambitions, and in leaving conscience free.

In Francis of Assisi another phase of the influence of Jesus comes to view. The man of Nazareth is taken as a model to be followed. His life is to be imitated. His manner of living is to be copied. To be poor as he and dependent on the gifts of others; to be unmarried as he and continent; to be homeless as he and walking about among men; to be simple and joyous and brave and earnest as he and occupied in doing good—this is to follow Jesus. It is a most significant shifting of emphasis from metaphysical speculation on his personality, appropriation of his saving grace through sacred rites, or outward obedience to his commands, to actual reproduction of his life. There is much that is external and artificial in this imitation, doing violence to individuality. But there is more that is of permanent value. For it is in this direction of character influencing character that the truest leadership of Jesus is likely to be found. The spiritual kinsmen of Francis of Assisi are chiefly to be looked for among the mystics. Men like Gerhard Groote, Johann Tauler, Thomas à Kempis, are only some of the best known representatives of large groups who before the Reformation discerned, with more or less clearness, that the greatest service Jesus can render as a leader of the sons of men

consists in the moral influence of his spirit and character upon the inner life.

The three great movements of organized dissent in the sixteenth century, the Lutheran, the Zwinglian, and the Baptist, reveal in different ways the leadership of Jesus acknowledged by them all. Against the prevalent idea that man could earn his own salvation by good works having the value of assets to his credit, or purchase it from the supererogatory works of other men, or secure it by such purchases made on his behalf by friends or relatives, Luther maintained, in accordance with Paul and Augustine, that man is justified by faith only, without works, through the grace of God. The object of this faith was Jesus Christ for whose personality, after some hesitancy, he adopted the definition of the Catholic symbols. The great importance of this "material principle" of the reformation lies in the fact that it removes all priestly mediation between the soul and Christ, makes salvation dependent solely upon a man's relation to his divine Redeemer, and does away with the idea that he can merit it by his good works. Luther, indeed, did not carry out this doctrine to its natural consequences, inasmuch as he ascribed saving value to infant baptism without a conscious act of appropriation of Christ by faith and, in the case of the eucharist, assumed a communication of the flesh and blood of Christ, "in, with and under" the elements, regardless of faith. The "formal principle" was the recognition of the Bible alone as the supreme authority. In judging of canonicity, however, he was inclined to apply the test of agreement with the material principle, and to rule out such books as Canticles, James, and Revelation. At first he enlisted the warm sympathies of the common people. But his attitude in siding with the princes in the uprising of the peasants had a tendency to alienate the poorer classes. The rulers, however, helped him to realize in a measure his ideal of a Christian state, which could serve as a bulwark against the aggressions of the papacy, and guarantee the permanency of his ecclesiastical reforma-

tion. In making the theological faculties at the universities guardians of the faith, and placing the young men to be educated for the ministry at these centers of varied learning, he gave at once authority to the specialist, and made provision against an one-sided development. Thus Luther labored according to the light he had, and laid the foundations better than several generations succeeding him knew. If he lacked the self-control, the gentleness of spirit, the catholicity of sympathy, and the depth of intuition that some of his fellow-laborers possessed, he loved the truth he saw, had the courage of his convictions, showed much practical discernment, and sought by all means to enhance the power, in state and church, of the divinely-human Master whom he served in sincerity.[1]

Zwingli resembled Luther in many respects; his conception of the Christ was similar; his loyalty to Jesus was equally marked. But his outlook upon life was broader and his spirit freer. This is manifest in his estimate of the religious character of Pindar, Plato and Seneca, in his assertion that the divine spirit was not limited to Palestine, and in his conception of the Lord's Supper as simply a memorial meal. In the manner of his approach to a theological question Luther instinctively felt a spirit dif-

[1] This estimate of Luther's character remains unchanged after the perusal of Denifle's *Luther und das Lutherthum*, 1904. There was an element of coarseness and sensuality in Luther, accentuated by the reaction against an unnatural mode of life. If Protestant theologians have been too prone to gloss over certain facts in the life of Luther and apologize, on flimsy grounds, for his vulgarity of speech and narrowness of judgment, Denifle lacks the ability to perceive his real greatness, which is more serious. It may be questioned whether, without Luther, we should have advanced in four centuries beyond Denifle, whose judgment upon Luther reminds of Luther, but has in it no promise of larger views. Denifle's charge against Luther that he abandoned the monastic ideal and broke his vows will not disturb the world. That he abandoned the common people and the cause of social progress is a more serious matter. But this was largely due to his early training, which rendered it difficult, if not impossible, for him to conceive of a state whose members were not from infancy forced to be Christians, and Christians of a certain type.

ferent from his own. It is in harmony with this general attitude that the question of infant baptism seriously disturbed him, and he seems to have been led to retain the practice by considerations of the far-reaching effects upon civil society of adopting the Baptist position rather than by theological arguments. As he insisted upon a more radical reformation of the church service, so he put more emphasis upon the reform of social institutions by the people itself. While Calvin's logical mind developed the material principle by accentuating the doctrine of predestination and the symbolical character of the ordinances, and strengthened the formal principle by an exegesis that was remarkably objective, yet appeared to succeed in exhibiting one doctrinal content in all parts of the canon, his activity as a practical reformer showed the same tendency to democracy tempered with theocracy. There can be no question as to the genuineness of his desire to see the will of his Master dominant in the life of the Christian community. That without the use of force the authority of Jesus cannot be maintained, is an inference that he could not avoid drawing from his conception of the functions of government and the character of the church.[1] But it is significant, in view of the subsequent development of political life in the various countries affected by the Reformation, that Luther and his colleagues leaned on princes by whose aid they were able to carry out their work, and whose authority over their subjects they em-

[1] The position of authority accorded to Calvin in Geneva seems to have caused a confusion from which his mind did not suffer, at least to so great an extent, in 1532, when he wrote his commentary on Seneca's *De Caritate*. In the case of Servetus, his judgment was further warped by wounded pride and personal resentment, as his own statements unmistakably prove. It would be wrong to hold his age responsible for his lamentable error. Yet the most powerful traditions and the strongest currents of thought in that period unquestionably rendered it difficult for him to reach the lofty position of a Balthasar Hubmaier, a Hans Denck, or a Sebastian Chateillon, which would have prevented him from playing such a disgraceful part in the judicial murder of Servetus. The great reformer has certainly a right to be judged by his best, and not by his worst.

phasized, while Zwingli, Calvin and their associates leaned chiefly on the burghers, and maintained the rights of the people against unjust rulers.

The Baptists, as a rule, rejected both the material and the formal principle. Characteristic of the whole movement were the emphasis upon character and the doctrine of "the inner light." With the current notion of "works" as a commodity, with a fixed value on the ecclesiastical exchange or in the celestial court, the Baptists had no sympathy. In fact their leading theologians were at pains to remove the remnant of this system of salvation by negotiable works of merit. To Denck and Tiziano faith did not mean belief in a transference of man's guilt to Christ and an imputation of Christ's merits to man, but trust in God and obedience to his laws, a confidence and obedience impressively exemplified by the man Jesus of Nazareth. This faith, they held, could never exist, or even be conceived, without works. They discarded all mercantile and forensic views of the atonement, and instead of justification as a reward for believing preached righteousness of life and works of kindness as the natural result of the indwelling principle of love, whose value and power may be seen in some lives more distinctly than in others, and with especial clearness in that of Jesus. According to these thinkers, man is not in need of being saved from the devil or from an everlasting hell, for they did not believe in the existence of either, but from selfishness and ignorance. By "the inner light" Denck understood the direct illumination of every human mind, according to its capacity, by the indwelling divinity. This light enables man to discern the truth in the sacred books or elsewhere. Following it holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Spirit, and through all ages divine truth continues to be revealed to men. By placing the authority of the inner light above that of the Scriptures, these early Baptists were naturally led to recognize not only the right of private interpretation of the Bible, and the consequent diversity of beliefs,

but also the propriety of Biblical criticism, and the liberty of prophesying new things. Denck's distinction between the permanently valuable and the only temporarily significant in the New Testament as well as in the Old Testament, leading him apparently before his death to regret that he at one time had attached an abiding importance even to adult baptism, is an instructive example. The recognition by Servetus of at least a primary reference of the supposed Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament to contemporaneous events and personalities is also significant. The accounts of Giuliano of Milan, indicating that in Baptist circles the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel was denied, the opening chapters of Matthew and Luke and some chapters in Mark were regarded as interpolations, and some of the Pauline writings were questioned, affords another illustration. From the principle of the inner light follows also the conception of the church as a local society composed of persons who have been enlightened. The rejection of infant baptism was therefore not exclusively caused by the absence of New Testament precept or precedent. A church thus constituted could not be co-extensive with the state, or civil society. It was a spiritual brotherhood, living in the world, though not of the world. Its aims and purposes were connected with the teaching and example of Jesus. Some of his ideas such as those concerning the overcoming of evil with good, war, oath-taking, judging, and private wealth, the value of the simple, trustful, joyous life, the coming of a better social order, the kingdom of heaven on earth, were widely adopted among the Baptists; and the testimony of their enemies, who often ascribed their apparent virtues to the inscrutable craftiness of Satan, the character of their preserved writings, their gentle demeanor during lives filled with severest trials and persecutions, and the noble courage with which they met the martyr's death, show how deeply they were influenced by his spirit. Thus it is possible to observe, in the case of a great historic movement, whose significance becomes more mani-

fest in proportion as the archives of Europe yield up their secrets, whether the real leadership of Jesus decreases or is enhanced by the recognition of his purely human character.

On the other hand, it was only natural that the Baptist position should be felt to be a menace both to church and state. At first sight it might appear very harmless that a good man prefers tilling his soil to killing his fellows, weaving his cloth to wearing the ermine, telling the truth to swearing an oath, bearing with patience insult and injury to demanding the punishment of his assailant, sharing his good things with others to heaping up wealth for himself, caring for his child to sprinkling it with water, loving and imitating Jesus to praising and describing him. But if this man should be right, society would be wrong in slaying its enemies, condemning its criminals, binding its citizens with oaths, bringing its grievances to courts, hoarding its treasures, saving its infants by baptism and its adults by formulas, sending its heretics to hell, and promising its saints heaven through the merits of the God-man. In reality, his gentle life, in spite of its innocent appearance, was a bold challenge hurled at all that was high and exalted among men, at the throne and the altar, the bench and the cathedra, the knight and the bishop, the man of lineage and the man of wealth. The challenge was accepted, and in a few decades these quiet seekers after a country of their own had been hounded to death, burned at the stake, or drowned in deep waters. Then, in Gothic cathedrals, amid incense and gold and treasures of art, Te Deums were sung, and in houses of worship but recently deprived of all emblems or images thanks were offered for the salvation of society to the man who many centuries ago had himself for the same crime been hanged upon a cross.

It cannot be denied that in the mother church the influence of the prophet of Nazareth was in some directions preserved and extended through the Society of Jesus. Its spiritual discipline, its educational system, and its mis-

sionary zeal were not only the most efficient means of reforming the Catholic Church and enhancing the power of the papacy, but also became instrumental in making the name of Jesus known in distant lands, his life regarded as an example, and his authority recognized with unwavering fidelity. Never since the days of the Stoics had the Western world seen an order of men exhibiting at once such talents and learning and such masterly self-control, indifference to outward circumstance and poise of character as those who regularly drew their inspiration from the Spiritual Exercises of Ignatius Loyola. Clearer than other reformers the leaders of this society recognized that, if the authority of Jesus is to be paramount over a human life, the training must begin in childhood and include the heart and the will as well as the intellect. To their missionary work in Asia, Africa and America, they brought a learning, an adaptability, a tact and a devotion, that for a time crowned their labors with remarkable success. In some measure this success was no doubt due to the method adopted by Xavier, Valignani, Ricci and other missionaries of assuming the dress and customs of the natives, and of adjusting the presentation of Christian doctrine to already existing religious ideas. There is no reason for questioning, on this ground, their purpose to bring their converts to a full acceptance of the teaching of Jesus as they understood it, and the readiness with which for his sake they suffered martyrdom testifies to their sincerity. But that which was the strength of this society also constituted its weakness. It derived its very existence from the desire of following Jesus. A Life of Jesus and The Imitation of Christ by Thomas à Kempis made a missionary of the soldier Ignatius. But while absolute obedience to the will of Christ as interpreted by his apostles or their successors may make an organization very powerful, its members are deprived of that freedom of conscience and moral initiative without which there can be no healthy religious development. And while a facile adaptation of means in themselves ques-

tionable to a high end may be fruitful of accomplishment, the end itself is apt to become unconsciously lowered and the work achieved to receive a taint.

The inherent weakness and gradual deterioration of the Society of Jesus called forth within the Church itself a significant protest. Whether or not Cornelius Jansen's *Augustinus* contained in germ the views attributed to him, there can be no doubt as to the Calvinistic tendency of thought among the Port-Royalists. Of more importance, however, were the independence of mind, moral discernment and spiritual temper of Antoine Arnauld, Jean Hamon, Angélique Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, and the system of education that trained for the world a Racine and a Pascal. Voltaire rightly regarded Nicole's Treatise on the Means of Preserving Peace with Men[1] as a master-piece without an equal in antiquity. Original as are the lines of inquiry pursued in this profoundly significant work, the influence of the thought and spirit of Jesus is quite unmistakable.

Whatever the historic connection may have been between the radical party of the reformation period and the quietists of the seventeenth century, the latter share with the former a certain approach to the Roman Catholic position on the one hand, and a decided tendency toward rationalism on the other. The radical bias is already visible to some extent in Michael Molinos, Madame de Guyon, and Jean de Labadie; in the Quakers it becomes more marked and of greater practical significance, and in the later Pietists it develops into full-fledged rationalism. By their emphasis upon grace and good works and a spiritual enlightenment not confined to the authors of the Bible, George Fox and William Penn, the Princess Elizabeth and Anna Maria van Schurmann, Jacob Spener, August Francke, and their successors drew nearer to the Catholic attitude than to Lutheran and Calvinistic principles. In England it was especially the state that felt

[1] Pierre Nicole, *Traité des moyens de conserver la paix avec les hommes* in *Essais de morale*, Paris, 1671.

itself menaced by the men who refused to swear, to "bow and scrape," to use the plural pronoun in addressing their superiors, and to bear arms. In view of such conduct, which was rightly considered as endangering existing social institutions, the objection to "steeple houses" and a hired ministry, the distrust of the trinitarian formula and all creeds, the rejection of baptism in any form as well as the eucharist, the doctrine of the inner light, and the inclination to universalism, could only be regarded as of secondary importance, however serious in themselves. In filling its horrible jails with men and women who had committed no crime, society only sought to protect itself against what it felt to be very grave dangers. It was not at all conscious of the fact that the Quakers in reality followed the leadership of Jesus in adopting some of his teachings that had been generally discarded, but to which he had himself attached great importance.

In Germany it was particularly the Lutheran church that found itself threatened by the pietistic movement. The opposition to the established clergy and the insistence upon a personal religious experience on the part of the religious teacher, the dependence upon private judgment leading to rejection of the creeds and critical treatment of the Bible, the desire for a broader fellowship of Christian churches regardless of dogma, the indifference to the sacraments and the active endeavor to gain influence in chair and pulpit, made pietism a foe with which the church had to cope seriously. In more than one field the Pietists signalized an inevitable reversal of judgment. The last began to appear as the first. Gottfried Arnold[1] depicted the history of the church in such a manner that the heretics were justified by their own suppressed writings, and bore off the palm of victory over the majorities that had condemned and crushed them. In his defense of Pietism against the common charge of hostility to cul-

[1] *Ketzergeschichte*, 1700.

ture, Dippel[1] subjected what had been regarded as erudition to a searching criticism, and with rare insight placed by the side of theology, within the sphere of erudite learning and liberal arts, jurisprudence and medicine, chemistry, metallurgy and mining, mathematics, industrial arts, agriculture, cattle-breeding and horticulture, while discounting the value to science and society of certain phases of theology, philosophy and jurisprudence. Edelmann[2] sought the value of Christianity and its chief claim to the attention of men, not in its alleged supernatural character, but in its rationality. Thus the fruit of a long development of thought in England, in which not only the cultivators of the natural sciences, the philosophers and the deists had participated, but also the theologians and apologists whose aim it had been to reconcile reason and revelation, was transplanted into German soil. From Herrnhut Zinzendorf directed a foreign missionary work, not relying on force or diplomacy, and not seeking the glory and aggrandizement of a church, but trusting to the Spirit and the Scriptures, and undertaken solely in the interest of the non-Christian peoples.

The Quietistic movement had its serious limitations, but it was characterized by a strong personal devotion to Jesus and his teaching. If, nevertheless, its subjectivity inevitably led to a more and more pronounced rationalism, the question naturally arises whether a further development of these radical tendencies would permit the continuance at all of such a relation to Jesus. At first sight the symbolical interpretation affected by the great German philosophers, and widely adopted by theologians, would seem to put this in doubt. Carrying out a suggestion of Spinoza[3] that it is not necessary to know Christ according to the flesh, but that no man can be saved without a knowledge of the eternal Son of God, the divine

[1] *Weg-Weiser zum verlohrnen Licht und Recht,* etc., durch Christianum Democritum, 1704, Vorrede.

[2] *Die Göttlichkeit der Vernunft,* 1740.

[3] *Epistola* XXI, Hagae, in Nov., 1675, ed. Bruder, II, 195.

wisdom manifesting itself everywhere but especially in Jesus Christ, Kant[1] drew a distinction between the historic Jesus and the archetypal, ideal man. According to him, the idea of a perfect humanity which is present with God from all eternity stands before the consciousness of man as an ideal which it is his moral duty to follow. Though it is possible that this ideal has once been realized, faith does not depend upon this possibility; and if in Jesus the divine idea became a reality, it was not through a supernatural birth or other miracles, but through a life in harmony with the divine pattern. Horst[2] looked upon the narratives of the virgin birth, the miracles, the resurrection and the ascension, not as history, but as poetry, setting forth an ideally conceived humanity, without the aid of which Jesus could not have been raised out of the common lot into an ideal attained, and yet again possible to attain. Hegel's theology shows the same tendency toward symbolism. When he suggests that the human being who manifests the truth that God is man and man is divine might be said to have the divine Spirit for his father and a human mother, inasmuch as he unites into one the transcendent divine nature and the sense-bound human self, it is evident that he translates the language of mythology into the language of philosophy, sacrificing the historical character of the virgin birth. And his treatment of the resurrection reveals the same peculiarities. But as his doctrine of the historical development of nations could not fail to direct attention to the difficulty of assuming a fixed ideal of humanity or even the possibility of its realization in an individual, it is not strange that, in an age strongly influenced by cosmopolitan ideas, the thought should arise and win favor that the true Christ, the real Son of God, to whom alone the doctrines deduced from the gospel can be applied, is the human race. Humanity is the child of the invisible father, the spirit,

[1] *Die Religion innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft*, 1793, ed. Hortenstein, VI, 156, 217, 227 *al.*

[2] *Museum für Religionswissenschaft*, 1804, p. 755.

and the visible mother, nature; it is the wonder-worker through whose power nature is gradually subdued and made subservient to the Spirit; it is sinless inasmuch as no blame can be attached to the general course of historic development or to the race as a whole, but only to the individual; it dies, arises from the dead and ascends to heaven, in that the natural yields to the spiritual, the outward separation of nations and classes ceases in the higher unity of the race, and the mortal is thus swallowed up in immortality. The man who believes in this Christ, and in sincere faith lives and dies for humanity, is saved.[1]

But whether the term "Christ" was used to designate the ideal human personality, or the human race in its gradual realization of its ideal, the distinction between the Jesus of history and the Christ of the creeds would apparently tend to eliminate the significance of the former. This, however, was not the case. As the miraculous element disappeared from the life of Jesus, his teaching and example claimed more attention. There was, indeed, a marked disposition to reduce his teaching to the level of the generally accepted moral maxims of the day. Yet these were themselves in a large measure the product of his influence, and were in advance of the ordinary conduct of men. The fact that his life was relieved of its miraculous features also rendered his virtues more real, and fostered a desire to emulate them, while emphasis upon the duty of following the highest ideal, whether it had ever been realized or not, removed the anxiety to produce a mere outward copy of his life.

It cannot be denied that these concepts of ideal humanity suffered from a certain artificiality. The ideal that one man should seek to realize can obviously not be identical with that which another man should set before himself. Beautiful and significant as the myths are that cluster about the life of Jesus in the gospels, they do not

[1] Such ideas are found in the first edition of Strauss's *Leben Jesu*, 1835, in the *Leichtfassliche Bearbeitung des Lebens Jesu von Dr. Strauss*, Zürich, 1841, and elsewhere.

naturally lend themselves as terms for the description of the collective life of man on earth. Already the description of the church as a collective Christ in I Cor. xii, 12, and in Augustine's famous comment, *Totus Christus, caput et membra,* threatened to deprive the term of its natural connotation, but it at least suggested an ideal society. Applied to the human race, it neither indicated a transcendent human personality nor a nobler form of social life, but the actual course of human history, or at best its upward tendency. If the welding together of the two names, Jesus and Christ, had originally caused a theological development entirely foreign to the thought of the Galilean prophet, their drifting apart seemed to signalize a new growth of Christological speculation. But though the symbolical interpretation of Biblical language and ecclesiastical terms conveniently served to hide the real thought, and to disguise its distance from the accepted standards of faith, it was a relief alike to the inquiring intellect and the religious sentiment to be brought back from vague abstractions to the life of Jesus by historical criticism. The long and painstaking investigations, carried on with ever increasing precision of method, a keen and cultivated historic sense, and a deepening religious appreciation, have not been in vain.

Much is left to be done; many problems still await their satisfactory solution, and many fresh problems have arisen as knowledge has advanced; not a few questions of great importance are still subject to serious debate among independent and competent investigators; some things historic research will, in all probability, never ascertain. But there is an unmistakable drift of responsible opinion to certain conclusions. After a very thoroughgoing criticism that has taken nothing for granted, but conscientiously examined everything within its observation, it is possible to-day to state, with assurance, that Jesus of Nazareth once lived among men, approximately when he lived, what were some of the external circumstances of his life, what was the general trend of his teaching, how his

personality affected different classes, and how he came to his death. Out of the mists of tradition enveloping him his majestic figure rises and stands out in bold relief against the background of his time. All fair-minded men will grant that he is worthy of respectful attention, admiration, and love. Those who have earnestly sought to become acquainted with him, allowing his thought to influence theirs, his manner of life to inspire them, and his spirit to touch their hearts, will gladly confess that they have found in this son of man something that the Christ of the creeds could not give, that to them the old conception, with all its splendor, is no longer glorious because of the surpassing glory of the new. As they look back over the centuries that have passed since his death, it is possible for them to trace to some extent the influence of this real, historical personality, obscured but never quite concealed by tradition, alongside with that of the fictitious personality created by the identification of Jesus with the Jewish Messiah and the Divine Logos. The former seems to them to have been more valuable in the past, and to hold more promise for the future.

CHAPTER XIII

THE PRESENT PROBLEM

Undoubtedly, the traditional conception of Jesus will long continue in the world, and through it his power will be felt as of yore. There seems to be no reason for expecting a very marked change of attitude either in the Roman or in the Greek Catholic Church on matters of doctrine that are deemed of fundamental importance, and are closely connected with the cult. But while the doctrinal system may be left substantially intact, there are forces already at work, especially in the Roman Catholic Church, that cannot fail to bring about noteworthy modifications of intellectual attitude and spiritual temper. The increasing demand for advanced education, and the difficulty of competing with well-equipped Protestant institutions of learning, will make it a matter of growing concern that Catholic scholarship shall be of the highest order. In course of time it must become apparent to those who have the welfare of the Church at heart that the greatest obstacle to the development of such a scholarship is the bias given to the mind by the assumption that in some important fields of inquiry conclusions are not to be drawn from the facts, but facts are to be interpreted in harmony with tradition; that truth is not to be sought, but certain statements are to be accepted as truth without critical examination and defended as such. In order not to lose its hold upon the young and its prestige in the world, the Roman Catholic Church will be obliged to grant, in ever increasing measure, freedom of investigation and of academic teaching, and to tolerate a more extensive divergence of opinion among its scholars. The constant growth of popular self-government must affect the Church in two ways, by gradually depriving it of all financial sup-

port and special favors by the state, and by extending the scope of local and individual initiative and freedom of action. The religious mysticism nurtured by the beauty and suggestiveness of an elaborate ritual will surely lead contemplative minds again and again into new paths, as they seek in the depths of their own consciousness for more immediate communion with the divine. The growing acquaintance among the Catholic laity with translations of the Bible, and on the part of the clergy[1] with Biblical criticism must also be assigned great importance. It is to be expected that the Catholic Church, living in the midst of vast democracies on equal terms with other religious bodies, unable and unwilling to undertake the forcible suppression of what it still deems heresy, will show its marvelous power of adaptation by directing its forces of religious sentiment and energy to the amelioration of human conditions and the elevation of moral standards, thus seeking by its life to prove its doctrine all divine. In so far it will reveal the influence for good of that son of man whom it continues to worship as a god.

In respect to dogmatic stability the condition of the Protestant churches is more precarious. The collective creed, whether expressed in officially adopted formulas, or defined by virtual agreement without written statements, is more exposed to the influence of private opinion. Symbols are revised, made of no effect by a liberal construction, or set aside completely. The Bible is put into the hands of everybody; the right of private interpretation is recognized at least in principle; a considerable measure of freedom is granted to theological teachers to adopt scientific methods in their work, and to follow the dictates of their conscience. Even the more conservative denominations are drifting away from the old doctrinal landmarks. A secular education, based throughout upon a conception of the world in

[1] The case of Abbé Loisy is not as isolated as it appears to many Protestants. There are not a few Catholic scholars who have adopted the main positions of modern Biblical criticism; and their number will increase.

general and of human history in particular, totally different from that of Hebrew and Christian antiquity, affects unconsciously the mental attitude of the laity, and the higher theological education of the clergy inclines to liberalism just in proportion as it is thorough and efficient. In the great universities of Europe and America and the leading theological schools there is not a single teacher of commanding scholarship who still adheres to the traditional view of the Old Testament. The line of cleavage between those inclined to a more radical criticism and those satisfied with removing the most obvious errors of tradition runs horizontally through all denominations. In the field of New Testament interpretation, the situation is indeed somewhat different. Canons of literary and historical criticism universally recognized by students of the earlier religious life of Israel are wholly disregarded, or followed hesitatingly, partially and inconsistently, or adopted as a matter of course, by equally eminent scholars. This difference in the treatment of the two parts of the Bible is also more marked in England and America than on the continent of Europe. There are many indications, however, that the time is at hand when the same methods shall generally be applied by Protestant scholars to early Christian literature and the Hebrew Scriptures.

Nevertheless, too much significance must not be assigned to this trend of theological teaching. There are great practical activities of the church that tend to preserve the types of thought vanishing from the centers of learning. The religious services, with their recitation of creeds and unexplained Scriptures, their doctrinal hymns and didactic prayers, their sacraments and sermons, as a rule tend to create a conservative mood, and to check the progress of religious thought. The various means employed to bring about a religious decision early in life are of great importance. The Sunday School, though narrowing its field of religious instruction, which might profitably be much wider, to Biblical exegesis, is for the most part wholly ignorant of modern methods of interpretation. By confirmation in churches practising infant baptism, by the corresponding

ceremony of baptizing Sunday School children practised by the Baptist churches, by Young People's Unions, Epworth Leagues and Christian Endeavor societies with their curious pledges exacted of everybody to talk in every meeting, the consent of the young to certain forms of belief is sought, and the adoption of certain stereotyped formulas of confession is encouraged, while the minds are still immature. Even such laudable endeavors to unite Christians of all denominations for common work as the Evangelical Alliance, the Federations of Churches and the Young Men's Christian Association have sought a doctrinal basis of fellowship, and in emphasizing what seemed essential without really being so have excluded Unitarian Christians on the one hand and Catholic Christians on the other. The foreign missions undertaken by the Protestant churches have grown out of a zeal which in some respects has not been according to wisdom, in so far as it has aimed, as enlightened missionaries do not now aim, to save the souls of the heathen from everlasting tortures in hell by an acceptance of the Christian faith, has attempted to rid them of their ancestral religion, root and branch, as of a wholly unclean thing, and has sought to substitute for it the tenets and practices of some Christian sect, as though these alone had a right to a place in the religious life of man.

Such obvious intellectual limitations will lead no discriminating observer to underestimate the value of the pulpit, the Sunday School, the unions of Christian workers, or foreign missions. The world owes much to the faithful and unselfish labors of a long succession of clergymen whose names have gone into oblivion, but whose ministry has been a blessing to their fellows. Men of English speech will always recall with gratitude, according as one type or another more strongly appeals to them, such preachers as Knox and Wesley, Edwards and Finney, Channing and Parker, Maurice and Robertson, Moody and Spurgeon, Beecher and Brooks. In a society increasingly jealous of all undue sectarian influences on the common schools, it has been the duty of the church to provide religious instruction for the young,

and the work of Robert Raikes, carried on by men and women sincerely devoted to the spiritual welfare of the children, has been a means of saving many lives from moral ruin and of developing many noble characters. Since the days when the first Moravian missions were established one denomination after another has sent out some of its noblest sons, men distinguished for piety, learning and character, to conquer the heathen world for Christ; and if they have made comparatively few converts from among the educated adherents of the various ethnic faiths, their success among the outcasts of India, the hill-tribes of Burmah and Siam, the cannibals of the Pacific islands would be worth every sacrifice, even if it were less apparent than it is, that wherever Protestant missions have gone all strata of society have been benefited by the introduction of sanitary reforms, improved methods of work, popular education, rational medicine and surgery, a higher condition for woman, and a better regulated domestic life. The names of William Carey and Adoniram Judson, of Robert Moffatt and David Livingstone will live as long as mankind shall cherish the memory of its great heroes. Nor is this apostolic succession of great missionaries likely to end. The church understands as well as the state the value of a war upon a common enemy in drawing attention from internal conditions; and the more spiritual the weapons become, the more eagerly will men of noble parts enlist in the ranks. Is the choice difficult at home between a creed hoary with age and a young science claiming jurisdiction in the name of reason, between a venerable and elaborate cult and a simple and spontaneous worship, between the ease of an establishment maintained by the special favors of the state and the precariousness of an independent existence demanded by justice, between building up an organization with the assistance and in the interest of the rich or preaching the good news of a better social order to the poor? Let the moral and material condition of the lower races be made the basis of appeal, the best results already achieved the inspiration for further efforts, the proclamation of the gospel in its

greatest purity to all the nations a matter of honor, an intelligent coöperation with the native forms of religious life instead of indiscriminate condemnation the method adopted, and love of Jesus and his cause the controlling motive, and there can be no doubt that vast forces of spiritual energy pent up in the Protestant churches may yet contribute to the uplifting of mankind in a missionary movement of unparalleled proportions. Thus the leadership of Jesus has not only maintained itself in various ways in the intellectually freest part of the Christian church, but promises to become more real than ever.

The most important question, however, confronting the thoughtful observer is not whether the influence of Jesus will continue to manifest itself more or less in the accustomed fashion within churches that, even if they were united, would include only a fraction of the whole population, but what attitude will be taken to him and his teaching by that large and increasing part of society which has drifted away from, or cannot be brought under, the influence of the church. In so far as this estrangement may be caused by moral perversity, a frivolous temper, or indifference to all higher interests, it does not yet present a real problem, as the church may reasonably hope for an ally in the awakened conscience and the sobered mind. Far more serious is the aspect of the case, when it is observed what the great agencies are that lead minds away from the tutelage of the church, or prevent them from accepting it. Chief of these are science, philosophy, art, and social idealism. The modern estimate of the universe, built up by careful observation of innumerable facts by a host of especially trained investigators, is fundamentally different from that reflected in the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. It will no doubt itself be greatly modified by future discoveries. But the change can by no possibility be in the direction of the views once left behind, because palpably based on crude impressions and unwarranted generalizations. There is not the slightest probability that the scientific world will ever return to the belief in miracles. The geologic ages will not

be wiped out of existence. The devil will never be raised from the dead. The physician of the future is not likely to revert to the theory of demoniacal possession or the practice of exorcism. Jurisprudence will continue to take cognizance of the Jewish legislation only as an important and suggestive chapter in the history of law. Theology itself can vindicate its position as the science of the religious phenomena of man's life only by adopting the comparative method, and by critically sifting its material. The former implies that the religious ideas and practices of different peoples and different ages be placed side by side, examined without prejudice, and judged with impartiality, while the latter involves a thorough textual, literary, and historical criticism of whatever sacred book may be studied. The various branches of science are to-day becoming known in ever widening circles, and the confidence in scientific methods is steadily increasing. Not only is this the case in Europe, America and Australia, but also in India, Japan and China. Thousands of scientific text-books are accomplishing a missionary work in the midst of the old civilizations of Eastern Asia that can never be undone by any church.

The tendency of science to emphasize the universality of law and the unity of nature has furnished a fresh impulse to philosophic speculation, and India has taken her place by the side of Greece as a teacher of dialectics. In its search for ultimate reality, philosophy is almost inevitably led to some form of monism. Materialism is apparently the simplest of these forms. But when the behavior of matter is carefully observed, it becomes manifest that it is not what it seems. The qualities that are perceived by the senses are recognized as not belonging to the essence. Some type of idealism is therefore most prevalent among philosophers. If matter is but an appearance, the substance is supposed to be mind, either as thinking subject, or as pleroma of thought, or as both. Thus Berkeley, Fichte, and Schelling in his earlier period conceived of essential reality as a thinking subject; Hegel regarded it as the unity of thinker and

thought; and Boström considered it as a system of personal ideas. Between the two positions that matter only exists, while thought is one of its products, and that mind only exists, while matter is nothing but a semblance, there seems to be room for other views. Kant was unwilling to admit that ultimate reality is dependent upon that action of the conscious subject which is reflected in the order of the phenomenal world. Schelling in his later years emphasized will as the realizing factor in opposition to thought, and suggested an obscure, unconscious ground within the divine being. From this position it is not as far as has been supposed to that of Schopenhauer, who conceived of the world as will and idea, or that of Hartmann, who looks upon the world-soul as unconscious but generating consciousness by the emancipation of the idea from the will.

The original cast given in these systems of thought by fertile and vigorous German minds to the age-long endeavors of philosophy to solve the riddle of existence should not be discounted. But the influence not only of Greek but also of Indian speculation is unmistakable. When the great Greek thinkers who for centuries had moulded the outward forms of men's reasoning in Christendom were at last permitted to affect the substance itself, the natural result was a certain similarity of the new structures to the creations of those ancient master-builders. A fresh and unexpected impetus came from the East when the philosophical systems of India, antedating those of Greece, became known in Europe. First came Brahmanism, then Buddhism. In the former, the place of the vanished gods is taken by a living universe, whose substance is spirit, and whose form is an illusion. In Buddhism the gods disappear altogether, and leave a world that is realized by the will to be, and from whose evil escape can come only by cessation of desire. The subtle philosophy of Bhagavadgita and the Upanishads found a response not only in Germany but also in America, where Emerson became the exponent of a transcendental idealism profoundly influenced by these works. In Schopenhauer and Hartmann the keener criticism of reality

characteristic of Buddhism seems to find its counterpart, familiarity with this type of Oriental thought is unquestionable, and Hartmann's hope for "the final redemption from the misery of volition and existence into the painlessness of non-volition and non-existence" exactly expresses Gautama's. This earnest search for the truth is no mere idle speculation. An ever increasing number of men and women are convinced that no advance in our knowledge of ultimate reality can be made except by comprehensive and accurate observation of nature, and a careful study of its reflection in the consciousness of man. To them the deistic idea of an extra-cosmic divine personality, existing before the universe, creating it out of nothing, ruling it from without, and destroying it at will, is quite inconceivable. The serious question with them concerns the essential character of nature, whether its substance is wholly conscious or only partially so, whether its infinite, eternal and exhaustless energy, in every moment and at every point, waits on an intelligent design, or consciousness and self-determination are only its incidental fruitage, and whether some of the individual manifestations of this energy may or may not preserve the continuity of consciousness in spite of apparent disintegration. And upon their ontology they build more or less consciously and consistently their theory of ethics and their principles of conduct.

In modern life, art commands an absorbing interest. With the increase and wider distribution of wealth architecture has become the concern of every citizen. Emancipated from conventional designs, it has developed novel combinations and pleasing varieties. Man is influenced unconsciously, but therefore none the less really, by the character of the home in which he resides. He thinks and feels differently in a Gothic cathedral from what he does in the auditorium of a modern church. Painting and cognate forms of artistic representation have become potent and significant factors. When the predominance of ecclesiastical subjects ceased, painters began to draw their motives from a wider range. Landscapes, animal life, portraits, do-

mestic scenes, historic events attracted their attention. Through the engraver, the photographer and the printing-press, artistic productions have found their way into the humblest homes. Interest thus centers everywhere upon works not immediately suggestive of religion. Music finds a growing number of passionate lovers. To those whose ears are attuned to harmonies of sound earth holds few delights equal to those that a Bach, a Beethoven, or a Wagner gives. Of the different forms of poetry it is especially the drama that exercises a vital influence upon men to-day. On the stage an interpretation of life in terms of beauty is attempted. The grandeur of human nature is portrayed, and its foibles are mirrored forth. The great passions that make or mar humanity, that elevate and refine, or ruin and degrade, are presented with the aim of likeness to life. Vast moral problems are set forth with unequaled vividness and power. The significance of character is brought out, and the worth of gentle manners. Trifling incidents of man's existence are pictured with a touch of humor that corrects the perspective, relieves the strain, and mellows the temper. Scarcely less important a place is held by the novel, which clothes with flesh and blood the skeleton of history, delineates character, depicts social conditions, sketches the possible interplay of circumstance and human action. These modern creations of the imagination are nearer to reality than the mythical lore of antiquity; the actors are men and not gods; the interest is fixed upon things regarded as secular from the ecclesiastical point of view.

But profound as is the influence of science and philosophy, art and literature, on that part of the population in Protestant lands which is not attracted by the church, the power of social idealism in some form is even more marked. However imperfect the realization of democracy may have been, the principle of popular self-government has gained general recognition in most European countries as well as in America and Australia. The theory of the divine right of kings no longer commands serious attention. Whether the chief executive is called president or king or emperor,

he is understood to be a servant of the state, such power as he has being delegated to him by the people. There still are many artificial limitations of the franchise, and the methods of expressing the people's will are everywhere imperfect, but the whole trend of political development is in the direction of universal suffrage and a more direct influence of every man and woman upon the management of common concerns. If at first the extension of rights of citizenship to the disfranchised seemed an end in itself, since it implied the enthronement of a new principle of political life, it gradually became apparent that its real significance consisted in being a means for effecting far reaching changes in social conditions. Many conditions once regarded as unalterable, imposed by Providence, or necessarily incident to all social life, are now looked upon as wholly dependent upon the will of the people and subject to any change it deems wise to institute. Whether a nation shall be plunged into war is for the most part no longer left in the discretion of a sovereign ruler, and the time cannot be far off when no enlightened nation will undertake a war without an opportunity being given to every man and woman vitally concerned to register a vote for or against it. If in a democracy sanitary and hygienic conditions are neglected, slums are maintained, excessive hours of labor and inadequate compensation for work are allowed, children are permitted to grow up without sufficient education to develop native capacities, a few are granted special privileges by which it is possible for them to amass enormous fortunes and thereby gain for themselves an illegitimate power over their fellowmen, while the many are handicapped and deprived of the full enjoyment of life, this is not because it must be, but because the many who have the power to effect the desirable changes do not yet perceive what ought to be, or realize what might be.

But the perception of higher ideals has grown with marvelous rapidity during the last century. Each school of earnest thinkers upon social subjects has contributed something of value to the forming ideal of society. If one group

has brought out more clearly the advantages of partnership and coöperation, another has rightly emphasized the value of stewardship and individual initiative. Some have rendered a real service by showing the inexpediency of leaving in irresponsible private hands public utilities that society would more profitably control, or own and manage through responsible servants, while others have with equal wisdom indicated a sphere of private activities still jealously watched and subject to public interference, which would more wisely be left to private discretion. As the pendulum swings between socialism and individualism, the errors of one-sided and exaggerated views become apparent. The demand that every member of society shall be obliged to render some form of useful service, and in return shall receive an equitable share in the common wealth, is not a whit less valid or important because of any incidental error in the theory of those who make it as to what constitutes legitimate labor or economic value, or an equitable share, or the most expedient method of securing a fair distribution. The views one day derided as empty dreams the next day are proved by sober tests to be based on good foundations. Economic methods regarded in one place as full of danger or impossible of application, in another place reveal their excellence and practicability.

The attitude toward recognized social evils has undergone a significant change. Antiquity said: Slavery is a necessity; but masters should treat their slaves in a humane manner; slaves should obey their masters, and make themselves inwardly free by a virtuous life. With us this antiquity reaches down to the last generation. The modern conscience says: it is wrong for a man to own his fellowman; and slavery should therefore be abolished. And slavery has been abolished. In the past, war has been looked upon as an honorable pursuit or an unavoidable evil, and civilized nations have been content with demanding more humane methods, kindlier treatment of prisoners, and better care for the wounded. To-day the conviction is growing that it is a crime for one nation to wage war

upon another nation, that such indiscriminate mass murder should be abolished, and that differences between states should be settled, as differences between individuals are, by the decisions of duly recognized courts. Disease, physical, mental or moral, once considered as the work of gods or demons, or deemed inevitable, is now seen to be preventable and curable. The idea that the mass of men must of necessity be ignorant, and fit only for work demanding little skill or intelligence, while education and extensive training can only be the special privilege of the few, is giving place to the view that every child should receive all the education necessary to develop a good and intelligent citizen, and to unfold the special aptitudes by which the greatest service can be rendered to society. Until recent times it has been generally supposed either that wealth is a sign of the favor of some god thus rewarding piety and virtue, while poverty is a curse inflicted by a deity, as a punishment for sin, or that the accumulation of vast fortunes in the hands of a small number of men and the economic dependence or actual penury of the masses are the necessary results of some mysterious law with whose operation it is dangerous or wicked to interfere. There have indeed been significant protests against one as well as the other of these superstitions, but they have too often been vitiated by a morbid preference for poverty, a narrow conception of human life, or an artificial scheme of equalization. At present the degrading influence of great wealth and of great poverty alike is seen by thoughtful men; and the conviction is growing that the grade of intelligence, freedom, virtue and happiness would be higher in a society where there were neither rich nor poor. It is widely recognized that the great fortunes are not due to marked obedience to any laws, human or divine, but in a considerable measure to clever circumvention of equitable laws, corruption of legislative bodies, governmental favoritism, and flagrant disregard of the most elemental principles of justice. That the organization of industry and commerce has been of considerable value in lowering the cost of production, improving the conditions

of labor, and obviating waste, is not overlooked by those who demand that the capital shall be more directly controlled by the people. Nor is the principle of private property, which renders possible the gratification of varied tastes and safeguards individual liberty, in any essential respect sacrificed when communities provide themselves, at the actual cost of obtaining them, with such necessities as water, gas, electricity, sewers, tramways, garbage incinerators, paved streets, parks, docks, wharfs, bridges, baths, schools, museums, galleries, theaters, administrative buildings, residences, stores, workshops, gardens, playgrounds and the like; or when nations take charge themselves of mails, expressage, railroads, telegraphs, telephones, steamships, canals, forests, mines, universities, academies of art, scientific expeditions, and a multitude of other legitimate common concerns. Conditions of life guaranteeing to each member of society an adequate education, opportunity of suitable work, stability of position, an equitable share in the produce of common toil, a high degree of individual liberty, a voice in the management of public affairs, and security against want in old age, are no longer regarded by competent investigators of social phenomena as unapproachable ideals but as ends to whose realization the political action of self-governing peoples should consciously and determinedly move.

The attitude of the church to this mighty movement of thought, endeavor and aspiration, involving the greatest moral questions confronting the modern world, has too often been one of indifference or positive hostility. During the long years when the abolition of slavery was agitated in the United States the pulpit in general aided and abetted the trafficker in human flesh, while the champions of liberty whose names the nation honors to-day were for the most part outside the pale of the church. If a minister espoused the unpopular cause, he frequently lost caste among his colleagues or jeopardized his position. The leading champions of woman's cause, her economic independence and political enfranchisement, have been without, the strongest defenders

of present inequalities within the church. Not without a certain degree of justice has the church, especially as it exists in the larger centers of population, been called "a capitalistic institution." Though there are many honorable exceptions, the leaders of the church as a rule have shown little sympathy with the aspirations of organized labor, little understanding of the aims of social reform, little courage to rebuke iniquity in high places, little capacity for grappling with large moral problems, little disposition to plead the cause of the weak. This applies to the European churches as well as to the American. No protest against the martial spirit and the constant increase of armaments has come from the Evangelical Church of Germany. The greatest peace-organization in the world is the Social Democracy, which recognizes no religion.

What can Jesus do for these millions for whom the church as it is seems to be able to do so little? What bread of life has he to give? What real needs of theirs can he meet? It is evident that if he is to give them anything, it must be truth and example, spirit and life. It is also clear that he cannot be their only teacher. In matters that must always seem to them of vital importance they will seek other guides. If a man would know the methods and results of investigation in any field of research, he must learn of those whose special gifts and characteristics, opportunities and equipment, have made them the best representatives of that particular branch of science. As a student of physical science, he will sit at the feet of men like Copernicus and Galileo, Newton and Laplace, Lyell and Agassiz, Faraday and Helmholtz, Linnaeus and de Candolle, Schleiden and Bichat, Lamarck and Darwin. At the hand of accomplished philologists, historians, archaeologists and literary critics the proper methods must be acquired by which it is possible to gain a knowledge of ancient civilizations, their languages and literatures, their social customs and forms of religious life. To determine the authorship and date of the Hebrew Scriptures and their true character, a thorough knowledge of philology, literature, history, mythology and natural

science is required. In so far as theology is a science dealing with the religious phenomena of man's life, it must base its conclusions upon a comprehensive survey of the facts as they are exhibited in the various religions, and present a critical interpretation of the different religious beliefs and practices. No philosopher could without serious loss pass by the great thinkers of India, Greece and Germany, or be justified in the attempt to construct upon the reported sayings of Jesus a complete theory of the universe, ignoring the subtlest and most penetrating thought upon the subject. The artist would miserably fail, were he to seek for his masters in Palestine. Even the social reformer can ill afford to neglect the patient and keen-sighted investigators of economic conditions and political relations, while endeavoring to derive from the Sermon on the Mount a complete description of what society should be. There are important features of the modern ideal not touched upon in the extant utterances of Jesus. He does not seem to have said anything concerning the necessity of education, the duty of work, the principles of distribution, the rights of woman, the use of the franchise, the ministry of art. It is not possible to infer from the Golden Rule how he conceived of its application to the complex relations of modern society, any more than this can be done in the case of the similar rule of Hillel.

Yet there are real and urgent needs of this intellectually maturer section of society that are of such a character that men may well inquire whether Jesus is not better qualified than any other leader of mankind to meet them. Science and philosophy, art and politics are far from being what they should be, and those who seek to give to life through them a greater worth and satisfaction often fail. While science has many devotees consumed with a passion for the truth and finding in this love an ample reward, there are also many to whom it is only a means of securing a livelihood, gratifying social ambition, or gaining notoriety, many coarse natures filling the circumambient air with their discordant cries, their arrogant assertions, their ill-bred clamor

for recognition, their wearisome priority claims, their angry denunciation of opponents, many unclean spirits slovenly in all their methods, dishonest in the use of other men's work, ignorant of the simplest commandments in the scholar's decalogue, and a host of parasites swearing *in verba magistri,* repeating the slogans of their clan, puffed up with knowledge not their own and incapable of an independent judgment or a fair and generous appreciation. If the great problems of philosophy are examined by master-minds basing their conclusions on wide and accurate knowledge, and preserving before the mysteries of existence a humble, docile and reverent attitude, they also attract multitudes who are ready to gloat over the downfall of ancient systems without any perception of the elements of truth contained in them, to accept the articles of some new creed without a personal investigation of their validity, to strip the world of its mythical veil without ability to look with chaste eyes upon its undraped beauty, to discard old rules and sanctions of morality without testing the foundations of a new ethics, or guarding sufficiently the sense of obligation. Much that goes under the name of art is a wretched counterfeit injurious alike to taste, good manners and morality. A mass of pictorial representations of woman's body, serving no legitimate interest of art, and not satisfying the healthy desire for beauty, but designed solely to excite sexual passions, is spread broadcast over our Western lands. The theater is too often false to its mission as an institution of high art. Neglecting the immortal works of genius and the better class of contemporaneous dramas, it frequently stoops to the presentation of works marked only by their inanity, coarse sensuousness and vulgarity. This evil would be more easily cured if the responsibility lay only with the managers whose financial interests lead them to cater to depraved tastes; but the public is equally at fault. The influence is mutual. Without popular support there would be no inducement to present anything but the best; without ingenious devices for whetting the appetite such abnormal tastes would not develop. Novel-reading has as-

sumed such proportions as to constitute a danger. A morbid craving for fiction may be developed even by the reading of good novels, and create a dislike for more substantial branches of literature, for scientific investigations, or for the ordinary work and experiences of life. But there is an abundance of bad novels, written in a wretched style, depicting crime in a fascinating manner, giving an exaggerated importance to the erotic element, tending to obliterate all moral distinctions.

In the struggle between antiquated institutions and a better social order the defenders are not always in the wrong, and the assailants are seldom wholly right. Even the best cause does not make so perfect a cleavage that all the sheep are upon one side and all the goats upon the other. The friends of reform have to reckon not only with the force of habit, the power of prejudice, and the vested interests arrayed against them, but also with their own errors of judgment, lack of experience and moral failings. How formidable are the obstacles that must be overcome, if war is to be abolished! Millions of men gain their livelihood by war. Millions of money are invested in machines designed for the destruction of life and property. Millions of children are brought up to look upon war as the highest expression of patriotism. National vanity, national greed and national prejudice urge the increase of armies and navies. Rulers and ruling classes rely for their power upon a soldiery sworn to blind and unquestioning obedience. On the other hand, the opponents of war often fail to appreciate the relative value of even an indignant and forcible protest against wrong, or to recognize the inadequacy of extant provisions for settling disputes between nations by civilized methods, or to estimate fairly the moral significance of any enthusiasm for the welfare of a people, any unselfish devotion to larger interests, however mistaken the expression may be. Still more deplorable is the fact that at critical times friends of peace so frequently are disorganized and inactive, allow themselves to be influenced to some extent by the passions that rage about them, lose confidence in the

more excellent way, and fearing the stigma of cowardice or treason become by guilty silence traitors to their deepest convictions and to their country's highest interests. The attempts to extend the suffrage to men of small means, men of different color, or women, run counter to the powerful instincts, strengthened by social conventions and religion, that lead the rich to lord it over the poor, the white race over the dark ones, the men over the women. But the way of reform is also blocked by the ignorance, incompetence, indifference to higher interests, ill-balanced judgment and ill-governed temper of the disfranchised. In union there is strength. Through organized efforts it has been possible to raise the standard of living for millions of workers, fix a maximum day and a minimum wage, make the employment of little children in factories illegal, improve the sanitary conditions of labor, and render the position of the individual less insecure. If, forgetful of these advantages gained for him by organized labor, a man thinks that he can single-handed deal with a powerful syndicate, and secure from it concessions that it is not in its interest to grant, he is grievously mistaken. But not less wrong is clearly the organization which resorts to violence to force such a man to unite with his fellows. Reproach is cast upon a worthy cause and irreparable injury done, whenever the passions are not restrained, and kept under the control of reason and a due regard for the rights of others. It is not sufficient in a democracy that there shall be a readiness on the part of the minority to respect the decisions of the majority; there must also be a willingness on the part of the majority to consider the rights and reasonable desires of the minority. As long as the interests of one class seem antagonistic to, or in reality conflict with, the interests of another class, social strife is easily kindled and intensified by success as much as by defeat. When the dumb and sullen resignation of a man to his lot, whatever it may be, gives place to hope and active effort for the improvement of his condition, a centering of all interest on material things is apt to ensue which often does serious harm to the finer in-

stincts of manhood. It is not to be denied that the social atmosphere at times seems saturated with avarice and lust and spite, and that the moral progress of the race is retarded by the lack of sterling honesty, unselfish devotion and considerate judgment noticeable in all social relations. Masses of men seem to be absorbed in the pursuit of things which perish with the using. The higher interests of human life seem to have no attraction for them. The ignorance and suffering and sin of their fellow-men do not fill their hearts with compassion and a desire to help. They apparently never ask themselves to what nobler use they might put the intelligence and power they possess as men. They appear to drift aimlessly toward ignoble destinies rather than resolutely shaping their lives into harmony with some exalted pattern. In their eagerness to satisfy every appetite and every passing whim, they lose their lives and fail of true self-realization. With mockery they treat every dream of social justice. No vision of a better order of society finds a hospitable reception in their minds. They seek not first the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, and therefore know not how to use well any other thing. They seem to have no sense of the deep and sacred meaning of life. Neither the nature by which man is surrounded, with its intimations of a rational order and inflexible laws, nor human history, with its suggestions of an upward trend and of powers that work for righteousness, is permitted to lead them to a reverent contemplation of the infinite source of their existence and a willing submission to cosmic moral laws, that they might have life, and have it more abundantly. It is this need of moral strength to realize a high ideal that constitutes the deepest problem of the age.

CHAPTER XIV

THE LEADERSHIP OF JESUS

Spiritual needs can only be met by spiritual means. If men and women are to be filled with such a passion for truth, such a hunger after righteousness, such a love of beauty, as shall lift and purify their souls, make their experiences deep and rich, render their characters strong and resplendent, and flood them with joy unspeakable and full of glory, flame must be kindled by flame, spirit breathe upon spirit, life touch life. There is no force in things to raise the sunken spirit. The power of gravitation cannot straighten out a crooked disposition. The treasures of a Croesus cannot fill the inner void. Cleansing the outside of the cup does not make that which is within pure. There is no balm in Gilead that will cure the wounded heart. It is the touch of man that heals. It is in human minds that those ideals are born which blaze like beacon lights and guide the erring. In human hearts spring up those mighty impulses, those powerful emotions, that quicken zeal and strengthen moral purpose. In the depths of great souls broods the destiny of the race. In them are fountains of eternal life. Out of the bosom of humanity deliverers come forth, each giving what he has to give. While other teachers may and will do much for our modern world, the healing, purging, elevating influence of Jesus is of priceless value. When his teaching, conduct, spiritual attitude and character are rightly understood, they become a source of strength and inspiration. No man can come in contact with him without feeling that life goes out from him. His touch is quickening. He is able to help the scientist in his investigation, the philosopher in his search for ultimate reality, the artist

in his creative work, the social reformer in his endeavor to cast in nobler moulds the common life. He may have known very little of astronomy or geology, history or literature, scientific methods or scientific results, but he possessed in a very marked degree such essential qualifications for success in any scientific work as a disposition to examine the facts for himself, independence of authority, confidence in his own judgment, capacity for inductive reasoning, love of truth, gentleness and firmness in presenting it, and willingness to make sacrifices for its sake. No student can listen closely to his words without being impressed with their ring of sincerity, their mission to make known what he actually thought, their testimony to careful observation and protracted reflection. His mental freedom, his loyalty to conviction, his kindliness of judgment are contagious. In his presence the scholar is ashamed of petty squabbles and pedantic ways, pride of knowledge and thirst for fame, denial of merit and narrowness of sympathy, swallowing camels and straining out gnats, and becomes reverent, truthful and considerate.

Jesus was a thinker, and can therefore help those who think deeply and earnestly upon the great problems of existence. He may never have dreamed of the numerous problems concerning the constitution of the universe and the faculties of the human mind that had for centuries occupied the philosophers of India and Greece, and he may have shared the current beliefs of his time in good and evil spirits. But when his eyes sought the invisible reality behind the phenomena of nature and he whispered "Abba," "Father," he recognized the inherent rightness, rationality and goodness of the ultimate reality. And yet this was no superficial view conveniently overlooking the facts that create difficulties. The gifted poet to whom we owe the Dialogues in the Book of Job saw far less clearly than Jesus the fallacy of the common belief that the world is so arranged as to secure prosperity to the good and to make adversity a sign of wickedness, or that to be right the world must be so ordered. The men on

whom the tower of Siloam fell were not sinners above those who escaped. The Father lets his sun shine on the good and the bad, and he allows his rain to fall on the just and the unjust. That, according to Jesus, is right. He perceived a law of compensation working with unfailing accuracy. When a man prays in public, that he may be seen of men, and men may see him, he has his reward. In the midst of his poverty the righteous man is rich, and when he is persecuted for righteousness' sake, he shares the joy that swells the prophet's heart. He who loses his life for the sake of the kingdom of heaven in reality finds it. Jesus looked into the depths of his own consciousness, and saw that, to be right, man's words and deeds must flow from a correct disposition, and that to be right this disposition must be characterized by the reverence and obedience, the freedom and confidence, the gratitude and affection of a son, as well as by the justice and equity, the sympathy and kindness, the considerateness and forbearance of a brother. This supreme regard for the inner reality makes the thought of Jesus so significant. Could the many in all lands whose minds are agitated by the great questions of philosophy be brought to his confidence in the essential rightness of the course of nature, his healthy acquiescence in the necessary conditions of man's life, his chastened joy in existence, his filial and fraternal attitude, his calm indifference to outward seeming, his deep concern for the springs of action, the hidden fountains of life, their vision would grow clearer, their grasp upon the important elements of each problem firmer, and their reasoning less exposed to the danger of being vitiated by undue moral influences.

In one province of art Jesus was a master. No man ever spoke as he. The beauty of his speech was as marked as its originality. Even the handful of fragments that has come down to us gives an impression of his extraordinary power. Though Oriental oratory abounds in figurative language and illustrative anecdote, and volumes of wise sayings prized "as apples of gold in

baskets of silver'' have been preserved from Hebrew antiquity, there is nothing that even approaches the parable of Jesus. It has the excellence that forbids imitation. There are works of art so perfect in their kind that the world instinctively leaves the sacred ground preëmpted by genius for other fields of endeavor. The beauty of nature impressed itself upon the sensitive mind of Jesus, and was reflected in the simplicity and grandeur, the harmony and radiancy, of his speech. Each work of art in the Galilean master's gallery stands forth in maiden purity, chaste, modest and unconscious of its loveliness, yet breathes the breath of life. These characters of his creation will live as long as the human race. Churches may rise and fall, theological systems may come and go, works of great merit may be dropped into the limbo of forgotten things, but the love of inspiring art will itself secure against oblivion the Good Samaritan, Dives and Lazarus, the Foolish Virgins, the Prodigal Son, the Sowers, the Widow, the Shepherd, and their companions. Jesus may have known next to nothing of sculpture and painting, of music and drama, and may have had no idea of their place in the moral and spiritual development of man; but he knew as few know the art of touching all the chords that vibrate within the soul, the emotions, the will and the mind, and to lift and refine whenever he touched them. It is better that men should eat than that they should starve; but without art the richest community is a poor-house. Yet art passes quickly from splendor and ripeness to a state of putrescence. If its educative and ennobling influence is to be maintained it must be held to high ideals. The tendencies that drag it down can only be counteracted by a general improvement of the moral tone. This the spirit of Jesus never fails to accomplish.

The gradual evolution of society is never the carrying out in detail of some seer's dream or some reformer's scheme. The noblest Utopias embody features that in the light of maturer thought and riper experience appear un-

desirable or positively harmful. The best laid plans of reform contain some dangerous and unwise elements. They should be judged by their general trend, their most distinctive features, and their spirit. However slow the progress may seem, the leadership in the thoughts and affairs of men goes ultimately to those whose ideas are greatest and have most intrinsic worth, and whose purposes are most benevolent and have the widest reach. The Sermon on the Mount may be far from giving a complete programme of social reform or a complete theory of social relationship. But in these and other utterances of Jesus he expresses ideas of such far-reaching importance, lays down principles so startling and revolutionary, that, if they should in the main commend themselves to men and find embodiment in their social life, a transformation of human society would be the result, and his leadership would become a more momentous fact than it has ever been. It was his conviction, to which he was faithful even to the end, that men should love their enemies, do good to those who use them ill, abstain from all retaliation, and overcome evil with good. The adoption of this principle would abolish war, do away with armies and navies that are a constant menace to the world, send millions of men back to productive and profitable work, and give millions of capital to useful industry and needed improvements, to education, art and science. As yet no Christian denomination except the little body of Quakers accepts the view of Jesus in its literal and unqualified statement, but outside of the Church there is a growing disposition to regard his attitude as both wise and practical. It is true that the millions in Europe and America who do not count themselves as Christians, but who strenuously oppose war, are more or less inclined to differ with Jesus as to the possibility or desirability of loving one's enemies. Nevertheless they are in perfect agreement with him on the crucial point, that one nation should not treat another nation as an enemy, and go forth to kill its people on account of some slight or injury done to it, or be-

cause of a difference in religious views or social customs. And great would be the gain in refinement of sentiment, gentleness of temper and nobility of character, could they be persuaded to adopt more of the principle of Jesus. This principle goes far beyond the establishment of international arbitration. But this is a step in the right direction. The day when the battleflags of nations shall be furled in the parliament of man, will be a day of triumph to the Galilean prophet. Nor can the approach of this day be doubted. Cannibalism, once rampant, scarcely exists in the world to-day. Slavery, once universal, is to-day banished from the civilized world. War belongs to the same category of institutions, and will fare as they.

Jesus applied this principle in other directions. He criticised severely the law of retaliation which was regarded as essential to the welfare of society and lay at the basis of all administration of justice. "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" was a legal enactment, a provision of the Jewish penal code. Jesus rejected it as out of harmony with his conception of righteousness. If a man's eye had been gouged out by his enemy, Jesus would not have him secure through judicial proceedings a similar operation upon the eye of this enemy. According to his judgment, a higher righteousness would be shown by returning good for evil, by seeking to eradicate the angry passion, to awaken a sense of shame and to arouse a desire for reconciliation through kindly treatment. The carrying out of his idea would lead to an abandonment of the current systems of punitive justice, and the introduction of methods designed to prevent the development of criminal tendencies and to effect a change in the criminal by example and environment. It would render obsolete both capital punishment and enforced idleness in jails. It would tend to remove that spirit of violence which expresses itself in murders and lynchings. Concerning the means to be employed in order to cure mental and moral disease, and to protect society against its ravages there may be room for differences of opinion; and it may be

doubted whether Jesus had given much thought to the various applications of his principle. But his general conception of how men should deal with evil-doers is gaining recognition in modern society.

Closely allied with the treatment of moral perverts is the passing of judgment upon men. The advice of Jesus was "Judge not!" With his deep intuition he perceived how impossible it is for any man to gain such a knowledge of the subtle workings of another mind, such a freedom from prejudice, and such a disinterested, impartial and sympathetic disposition as to justify his assuming the part of a judge, while his deeply religious nature shrank from assigning to fallible man a function belonging only to God. The present generation appreciates as men have never done before the tremendous power of heredity and environment, the complexity of human nature, the multitudinous motives leading up to every act, the impossibility of ascertaining all these influences, and the incompetency of judgments based on assumptions of knowledge not possessed and of freedom not exercised. Minds influenced by modern science are more and more inclined to abstain from judging. Even judicial proceedings assume increasingly the character of scientific investigations leading to conclusions, tentative and subject to revision, as to the most expedient course to be pursued in order to secure for all members of society the greatest measure of profit and happiness during their life on the earth. If the thought of Jesus should become widely prevalent, the tendency would be to eliminate all condemnation, and to narrow the sphere of judicial inquiry. His words to the woman taken in adultery, "Neither do I condemn thee," indicate his customary unwillingness to drag before the gaze of men and submit to their judgment what essentially belongs to the privacy of life. In this society may wisely follow his example.

Jesus laid down the principle that when men live together as they should there is none among them who lords it over the rest or who exercises authority over them, but

they vie with one another in rendering service. It would be impossible to reject more emphatically the divine right of kings, or to express more beautifully the ideal of democracy. It is not only the reign of anointed monarchs that Jesus looks upon as wrong, but all lordship. His ideal is not a dead level of mediocrity. He recognizes the legitimacy of the desire for greatness. But greatness should not consist in power to rule over men. It should consist in increased power to serve. With the growing demand for popular self-government and the constant extension of the suffrage, it is only a matter of time when the kings and emperors of Europe and Asia shall have lost such autocratic powers as still remain to them, and shall have been obliged to surrender their dynastic claims. Far more serious is the question how long the oligarchies of wealth that form the real power behind all governments and exercise a lordship kings might envy, shall be able to maintain themselves. But vastly more important than the elimination of irresponsible authority in any form is the temper of the developing democracies. Ill fares society when ruled by mobs. The power wielded by masses of men egged on to deeds of violence and injustice by hatred, selfishness and thirst for vengeance is never so terrible as when it is used in the name of the whole people. Then the reaction inevitably comes. The horrors of the Napoleonic wars follow the horrors of the French revolution. A people can successfully manage its own affairs only in proportion as its citizens are enlightened and unselfish, capable of service and eager to render it, regardful of the rights of others and anxious to help the largest number, content with giving directions as to the general policy, and willing to leave the details to specially trained and responsible servants, courageous in their protests against wrong, and peaceful in their methods of righting it. When in a quiet and dignified manner Jesus criticised a tax imposed on him that was prescribed in the Law, and yet paid it under protest so as not to cause offense, he set an admirable example of the most successful social agita-

tion. It would be wise in those who have earnestly at heart the cause of popular self-government to follow the leadership of Jesus, whose aim is sufficiently high for the most thoroughgoing reformer, and whose method is justified by the lessons of history.

To maintain the authority of kings and governments, the obedience of soldiers, the orthodoxy of theologians, the veracity of witnesses, the fidelity of husbands and the subordination of wives, the oath has been deemed a necessity. Jesus said, "Swear not at all!" The nominally Christian state has never recognized the wisdom of his counsel, and the Church for its convenience has furnished a wholly improbable interpretation, by which Jesus did not have in mind any oath that really meant anything, but only the senseless curse-words with which the ordinary conversation of some men is too redolent. The early Christians, the Baptists of the sixteenth century, and the Quakers understood him, and manifested by their lives the profitableness of his teaching, since no legitimate interest of society suffered by it, and the regard for truth and the fidelity to duty on which all social order rests were strongly enhanced by it. Thoughtful men at the present time look upon the oath as an anachronism in a society that does not demand or enforce belief in a god. Believers in republican institutions regard oaths of allegiance to monarchs and dynasties as prejudicial to the best interests of a people. When a soldier is requested to swear that he will obey his sovereign without a question, even though he order him to shoot his father and mother, or to follow blindly his general, even though he lead him to deeds of brutality and treachery, this is so palpably an insult to his manhood that civilized men would not tolerate it for a moment, were it not for the mistaken notion that differences between nations can only be settled by war, and that a strong army pledged to unquestioning obedience is a protection to the state. The more liberal sections of the Church are thoroughly ashamed of the oaths by which ministers and teachers bind themselves not

to depart from certain doctrinal statements, not to advance in the knowledge of the truth, and people outside the Church look with pity upon men who are not free to investigate and to proclaim their convictions, with censure often upon those who in spite of their oath claim liberty of conscience, and invariably with more or less distrust upon leaders who are not expected to lead. Truthful men will not lie in a court or anywhere else, and in this age of the world few wicked men are deterred by the fear of hell from bearing false testimony in a court or anywhere else. If the relations of man and woman are based on true love, no oath can give an added guarantee of faithfulness; if love is not the basis, no oath can make the union moral. There is no reason why a woman should pledge herself to obey a man. While strong prejudices still prevail against the view of Jesus, and powerful interests are arrayed against it, the tendency of modern thought is distinctly in favor of his position. If men would follow where he leads, they would come to a society where oaths are never heard.

Some of the most delicate and important social questions of the present day deal with the economic, political and domestic position of woman. It is not probable that Jesus was led to consider the possibility of woman's economic independence, or the desirability of her political emancipation. But he had occasion to meditate profoundly upon the treatment accorded to woman in his age and by his people, and he expressed in word and deed convictions on this subject that are as important to-day as they were then. When he criticised Moses for having given in the Law a concession to the men, on account of the hardness of their hearts, contrary to the will of God as expressed in the beginning in the creative act, he emphasized the equal right of man and woman in the marriage relation. In view of this unmistakable import of his saying, the errors that lie on the surface fade into insignificance. It is readily seen to-day that Moses had nothing to do with the Deuteronomic legislation, that the

dismissal of wives was no innovation at the time when this code was written, that there never was a first man, that man in primitive conditions did *not* practise monogamy, that the law was very far in advance of the rules regulating sexual intercourse in earlier forms of social life,[1] that this law was intended to secure to woman, and in reality did afford her, protection, inasmuch as by the letter of dismissal the husband renounced all his rights over her, and could not legally interfere with her marriage to another man, and that the absolute indissolubility of marriage would result in greater misery to woman than that produced by the law, by perpetuating immoral relations, annulling the existing rights, and making her slavery complete. The important fact is that his sympathy with woman led him to condemn the Mosaic legislation in this matter, and to contrast its discrimination in favor of the man with the equality implied in the narrative of man's creation. At bottom it is an appeal from human legislation to the divinely ordained nature of man and woman. Such is the relation between man and woman as a result of their creation, and consequent natural peculiarity of forming a unity by supplementing each other, that it cannot be right to allow a man to send away his wife in order to take another, and thus to leave a woman at the mercy of her husband's caprice. In so far as Jesus by taking this position declared his conviction that man should not be accorded rights withheld from woman in the married relation, he made himself one of the great champions of woman's cause.

That his attitude on this question was born of sympathy

[1] On the other hand, it is decidedly inferior to the *Law of Hammurabi*, which recognizes the right of a woman to divorce a husband she cannot love and marry "the man of her heart," *Code of Hammurabi*, ed. R. F. Harper, Chicago, 1904, §142, Cf. §137. This code confirms the impression already gained that both socially and economically woman's position was higher in Babylonia than in Syria. Cf. the interesting observations on woman as a cultic official in Babylonia by I. Peritz in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1898, p. 119 f., and note the civic rights of hierodules recognized by the Code.

with the weaker part, is manifest from his protest against social ostracism of woman. He not only administered stinging rebukes to the pious and respectable scribes and Pharisees who cast off their wives that they might marry more desirable women, and then hypocritically drew about them their skirts not to come in polluting contact with those whom they had themselves driven into a life of shame, but he fairly invited adverse criticism upon his conduct by eating and drinking with women of ill repute. Neither did he think that aught would be gained by socially ostracizing the scribe and the Pharisee. It seems to have been the prevailing view in the church that his attitude and example in this respect should not be recommended. The policy of Christian society has differed little from that of Jewish society attacked by Jesus. In order that the home might be protected, thousands of tender-hearted women who have loved not wisely but too well, thousands of ignorant and confiding victims of man's lust, thousands of weak and sorely tempted children unable by the pittance that their hands could earn to keep the wolf from the door, have been thrust out of society to form a class by themselves, living in idleness, shut off from helpful influences and noble associations, forced to simulate affection or to center all attention on the sexual function, outraged by police inspection, scorned by those they cared for, preyed upon by persons coining money out of their misfortune, themselves becoming misers by the unnatural trade, or reckless spendthrifts during the brief hey-day of their beauty. But this segregation has in no way tended to protect the home. It has only separated one group of women from another to the physical and moral injury of both. The men have not been subject to such a division. Whether they have thoughtlessly yielded to an impulse of youthful ardor, or sought an illicit compensation for their social or economic inability to contract marriage, or wickedly designed and brought about the ruin of young lives for the satisfaction of their morbid cravings, they have often seemed to go scot-free, and re-

tained their position in society. It is natural that a sense of the injustice of such discrimination should lead to a demand for a similar social ostracism to be applied to the men. But it is perfectly clear that this plan cannot be carried out, and that our present evils would not be remedied, if it could. The maturest study of the situation indicates the wisdom of the attitude of Jesus. Let human intercourse be natural, kind, sympathetic, free from hypocrisy, self-righteousness and condescension, dignified and self-controlled, yet marked by thoughtfulness and chivalry.

This disposition on the part of Jesus is all the more significant as in his own life he seems to have suppressed the sexual instincts. He was a celibate and apparently commended to others celibacy for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. As an answer to the question whether it is well to marry at all in view of the demanded indissolubility of marriage, Matth. xix, 10-12, can only be understood as affirming that celibacy is to be preferred, especially by those who care for the kingdom of heaven.[1] And celibacy with Jesus meant absolute continence. This is evident from Matth. v, 27-30, where the man who looks upon a woman to lust after her is characterized as an adulterer and the sacrifice of a member for the salvation of the whole body is recommended. According to Luke xx, 27 ff. and parallels those who are accounted worthy to rise from the dead and have a share in the world to come neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are like angels in heaven. Our fragmentary record of his sayings does not tell us whether Jesus ever suggested that men might marry, and women bear children, and parents bring up their little ones for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. Would that it did! But a warning against entering upon marital relations without a careful consideration of personal fitness for propagating human life is as timely now as in the first century; an admonition not to cherish sexual desires tending to express themselves in faithless deeds is

[1] The text referred to is, however, of doubtful genuineness.

as necessary; and a protest against giving to the sexual relations an exaggerated importance is as wholesome as then.

But Jesus not only objected to the law of divorce because of its discrimination in favor of the men, and its permission to sunder relations originally intended to be indissoluble; he also indicated his disapproval of the punishment of a woman taken in adultery. The law prescribed that such a woman should be put to death (Lev. xx, 10; Deut. xxii, 22 ff.). If Jesus had believed that the law on this point expressed the will of God, and that the welfare of the community depended upon the punishment of such crimes, he would naturally have referred to the passages in the law that determined the procedure in this case. Instead of that, he skillfully shifted the whole question from the ground of legal procedure to that of justice and fairness. "Let him who is without sin among you first cast a stone at her!" The moral effect of these words, revealing like a flash of lightning how little right these men had to bring about this woman's death, was such as to prevent any action on their part. But if this principle were admitted, and the administrators of justice were to consider not only whether a crime has been committed, and what the legally prescribed penalty is, but also whether their own lives and hearts were so free from sin that they would feel competent to condemn a fellow-man, the most far-reaching consequences would follow. In the case of a woman taken in adultery the progress of civilization has to a certain extent justified the position of Jesus. In most civilized countries she is neither burned at the stake nor stoned to death. She is still set in the pillory, made a target for a thousand arrows, publicly exposed to insolent questioning and ribald jest, obliged to furnish an interesting chapter to the *chronique scandaleuse,* forced to tear out her heart and reveal the intimacies of her life, driven under the lash of judicial inquiry to gratify the hunger for piquant details of countless newspaper readers. Nor are the cruelty and

indecency of these divorce proceedings to any marked extent abated by the fact that the erring husband may be subjected to the same treatment. Here again the maturest reflection of the age moves in the direction of the thought of Jesus. The scene which closes with the shamefaced departure of the would-be judges, the solemn word, "Neither do I condemn thee," and the return of the woman to her fire-side with the impression of a new and nobler type of humanity, prefigures the course of social development that the human race is likely to follow. The chaste and loving heart of Jesus protested against the indignities heaped upon woman by man, his wantonness in using her, his cruelty in abandoning her, his hypocrisy in condemning her. In the same spirit we may go on to demand for woman equally great advantages of education, equally good opportunities of economic independence, equal rights of citizenship, freedom to work out her own life, to seek or to be sought, to give or to withhold, respect for her private relations, for the intimacies of maidenhood, wifehood and motherhood.

Profoundly significant are also the views that Jesus expressed in regard to wealth. There are indeed numerous questions upon this subject that in all probability never presented themselves in any form to his mind, and whose far-reaching moral significance he would not have been prepared to grasp. Even a man far more familiar than he can have been with the economic condition of the Roman empire and the other kingdoms of the world would have been quite unable to understand the commercial and industrial situation of the present time. The questions that confront us affecting the relations of capital and labor, the control of either through the suffrage, the freedom or constraint of trade, the principles and methods of taxation, the rate of wages, the standard, denomination, and issuance of money, cannot be solved without a careful observation of the facts of modern life and deep reflection upon the significance of these facts, upon economic laws and social tendencies. Each age must grapple with its

own problems. But behind these there loom up vaster ones that belong to all ages. Jesus watched the effect of wealth upon the character of men. He also observed the influence upon character of the practice of sharing with others. And he perceived both the danger and the needlessness of worry.

As a reason why a man should not lay up treasures for himself on the earth he pointed to the danger of this occupation. The mind and the affections would naturally center upon the object of constant pursuit. Longing for possessions, respect for wealth, worship of Mammon would insensibly take the place of love of God and fellow-man. A desire for more than is needed and more than is fair would unconsciously lead to a disregard for the needs and rights of others, and consequently become a source of all evil. It was this conception of the detriment to character inevitably resulting from the pursuit of wealth, and not a notion that he was himself exceptionally prone to the vice of avarice, that caused him deliberately to choose the poor man's lot, though he might have made money as a rabbi or exorcist. It was this sense of danger in the possession of wealth, and not any extraordinary cupidity manifest in the attitude of the young man who so strongly attracted him, that led him to give his famous advice. In thus emphasizing the deteriorating effect of wealth upon character, Jesus presented a conviction, the truth of which is borne out by the observations of thoughtful men, and should have a wider recognition in the world than it has. Even if, with the advance of human civilization, social conditions should undergo such a change as to eliminate completely the type of poverty now existing as well as the abnormal fortunes that at present constitute so great a menace to society, the spirit which seeks for things without knowing how to use them, heaps up treasures for its own satisfaction only, desires more than it needs, delights in individual comfort more than in the common weal, and loves the things that perish with the using better than the spiritual possessions of man, would still be a danger. As

conditions are to-day, it is perfectly evident that just in proportion as the laying up of treasures for himself becomes the absorbing interest in a man's life, justice and mercy, regard for the rights, liberties and welfare of others, search after truth, love of goodness, simplicity, uprightness and moral heroism, tend to disappear. There may be no St. Peter at the gate of heaven revising the carefully considered judgment of the church in such matters, but it remains a truth that, in the very nature of things, a man whose heart is set on riches cannot enter the kingdom of righteousness, love and truth. It should therefore be the endeavor of all good men so to modify by wise measures the methods in vogue at present as to render it increasingly difficult for a man to secure an inordinate share of the common wealth to the ruin of his character.

This attitude toward wealth does not seem to have sprung from a morbid love of poverty for its own sake. On the contrary Jesus seems to have regarded poverty as an evil. In the coming kingdom there were to be no paupers. His gospel was good tidings to the poor. His sympathy went out to the needy ones. He shared with them his homely fare, his bread and fish. Considering how difficult it was for a poor man to secure even a much needed loan of money, and to pay the interest on it, he counseled those who had money to lend gladly, and to look for no interest. Considering how difficult it was for many a man in destitute circumstances to assume any financial obligation, he advised his disciples to share such things as they had with the needy. A saying that escaped the attention of the evangelists declares that "it is more blessed to give than to receive."[1] In order, however, to enjoy the full benefit of this blessing, a man should avoid not only public attention but also self-consciousness and pride. He must not let his left hand know what his right hand does. A sense of decency should prevent him from feeding his starving brothers in public. Sharing with others should be as natural as breathing, and as unconsciously per-

[1] *Acts*, xx, 35.

formed. Jesus and his disciples led a simple life, holding things in common. The early church to some extent seems to have followed this example. Whether the narrative in Acts is strictly historical or not, it reveals a Christian ideal. In the case of such and similar communistic experiments, it is not the outward form that is important, but the spirit. It matters little whether the common property of the church in Jerusalem was managed wisely by the apostles, how many sympathizers Ananias had, how far the distress that Paul's collections sought to relieve was the result of the form of communism practised, or to what extent the example set by the first church was followed by other disciples of Jesus in the early centuries. It is of profound significance that, under the influence of the spirit of Jesus, some of his followers proclaimed the great principle, "from each according to his capacity, to each according to his need."

The deteriorating effect upon the inner life of man of the constant anxiety for the morrow did not escape the attention of Jesus. He saw men shrunk and shriveled by corroding cares, dwarfed in their development and marred beyond the semblance of humanity by the all-subduing, all-absorbing thought of bread. He heard men ask, "What shall we eat?" and "What shall we drink?" and "Wherewithal shall we be clothed?" until all other questions were hushed, all other interests disappeared. And he understood that the deepest cause of this worry that kills is not to be found in abnormal social conditions but in an abnormal mental attitude. Men fail to apprehend the fact that their livelihood depends not only on their own exertions, but even more on the good will of their fellows and the bounty of nature. They fail to see that just in proportion as they seek the kingdom of heaven and its righteousness, the perfect order of society and its correct relations, their own needs as individuals are met. They lack confidence. Nature is rich. Our planet is stocked with all things needful for the support of the human race, and the gratification of its varied tastes. Jesus was impressed with this ample provision for the

humblest life, this beauty lavished on the most ephemeral creation. He reasoned from the less to the greater, and grew serene. The human race is rich. It possesses in its primal relationships a wealth of social sympathy that inures to the benefit of every individual, and in its collective enterprises a potent means of conferring good upon all its members. Whatever the peculiar forms of domestic life may be, the facts indicated by such terms as husband and wife, father and mother, son and daughter, brother and sister, suggest protection, care and sympathy. Kinship means security. Gradually, the moral forces operating through kinship seek a wider field. By covenant or conquest new social organisms develop, and a new kinship, not based on blood, but on community of interests, and similarity of intellectual and moral life. This fraternity without blood-relationship secures even more effectively the safety and welfare of the individual. Jesus reflected much upon the significance of the principle of brotherliness. In view of the abundant resources of our home in nature and of the human family, a child of man may well cultivate an attitude of quiet confidence, banishing worry and care by broad interests, generous sympathies, resolute activity and a trustful disposition, even though the utilization of nature's forces and the fraternal organization of society be as yet very imperfect. We may hold in firmer grasp the present aspects of the great question, and may readily observe certain limitations due to time and circumstance, but the underlying principles which alone are of permanent importance were touched by Jesus in such a masterful manner as to challenge forever the attention and serious consideration of men.

The attitude of Jesus to the popular religious customs and institutions of his time, to sacred persons, places, days and acts, to public prayers, almsgiving, and fasts, is calculated to increase the confidence of modern men in his leadership. He claimed for all men the rights accorded to a priestly class. He seems to have cared nothing for the continuation of sacrifices, would make the temple a house of prayer for

all nations, and feared no evil for the cause of religion from its destruction. The evangelist who put upon his lips the statement that the time would come when men would worship neither in Jerusalem nor on Gerizim but would worship in spirit and in truth[1] understood the mind of his Master. He maintained that man has a right to determine what to do on the sabbath, since the sabbath was instituted for man's benefit. He neglected and criticised sacred ablutions. He never ordained either baptism or eucharist. He disapproved of public prayers, publicly announced or distributed gifts to the poor, and public fasts or displays of spiritual contrition. He was opposed to taxation for the maintenance of the religious cult, and to the use of force in the interest of religion. He criticised freely the scriptures, chose what seemed to him good, rejected what seemed to him bad. He appealed directly to the judgment of men. There is nothing about him that savors of the priest. It is impossible to conceive of him as smearing the horns of the altar with sacred blood, or swinging a golden censer, or chanting a litany, or elevating the host. In all these respects he appeals very strongly to those who seek to make religion a private affair, neither hindered nor assisted by the state, to free the religious sentiment from its bondage to formalism by relegating the modesties of the soul to the closet, and to insure the supremacy of the ethical element. His position is at once instructive and inspiring. It shows how gentleness and reverence may blend with liberty and boldness to achieve the most lasting results.

That Jesus declined to assume the position of a Messiah, a king of Israel, though many ardent nationalists apparently urged him to head an insurrection, some of his most intimate disciples hoped that he might appear in the rôle of a Son of David, and not a few pious souls longed and prayed for a just and God-fearing native ruler, but preferred to be known to the world as the Prophet of Nazareth, as one of the heralds of righteousness and truth his people had had, does not decrease, but increases, his glory in the

[1] *John*, iv, 23.

eyes of thoughtful men. Had he actually cherished a desire to rule over the Jews, and the other nations so far as they could be conquered, or to come back upon the clouds after his death with flaming fire to take vengeance upon his enemies,[1] some of his profoundest and most touching sentiments would sound like hollow mockeries. He appears to us a nobler man because he resisted the temptation. For his sake and for ours we rejoice that he forbade his disciples to say that he was the Messiah. When he humbly deprecates the title "Good Master!" on the ground that none is good but one, namely, God, a majesty invests his figure such as no self-assertion could have lent it. There is nothing monarchical about Jesus. It is quite impossible to conceive of him either as a despot or as a figure-head, sitting on a throne, with a crown upon his brow and a scepter in his hand. His ambition was, not to rule, but to serve. It was a deep-seated conviction with him and not a well-sounding phrase, that he is great who serves, and he is greatest who serves the most. Even his disciples failed to see his real greatness. Almost unwittingly and with the best intent, they misinterpreted some of his most significant utterances, and the early church handed down his sayings in a form that left the impression that Jesus, far from seeking himself to realize the high ideal he held up before others, was anxious to secure the honors of royalty, eager to obtain power over the nations, jealous of his authority over men, yea, even thirsting for vengeance upon his foes.[1] Fortunately, it is possible to remove the later accretions and to perceive the truth that is better than the best thought of many generations.

This ideal of service, however, would not be of so great a value, if it were not joined to a very high conception of human nature. The spirit of the autocrat was not more foreign to Jesus than the spirit of the slave. There was no touch of base obsequiousness in him. His ministry was that of a free man. And he did not wish to see servility in others. He did not raise himself above the level of human-

[1] Such were the notions cherished by the author of II *Thess.*, i, 8.

ity demanding authority and exercising lordship over his followers; he looked upon all men as his brothers, and wished to help them to live as sons of God, seeing the element of goodness and the vast potentialities in them. His sense of the worth of every human personality, his tender treatment of the bruised and wounded spirit, his delicacy in dealing with the tattered fragments of humanity, his reverence in the devastated shrine, characterize the spirit that is needed to lift mankind again.

At the first view, Jewish and Christian eschatological schemes no doubt have the appearance of being utterly at variance with the order of ideas fostered by modern science. Sudden transformation scenes are no longer expected. Though we have no absolute guarantee that the earth may not perish at any time by what we are accustomed to call an accident, there is a strong and widespread confidence that our planet will live out its natural life and that long ages of human history lie before us, during which the race will gradually work out its destiny without any cataclysmic change or catastrophe. How far Jesus may have shared the common expectations of his time as to the ushering in of a new age by marvelous changes in nature and in human society, is extremely difficult to determine. But the prophet's eyes are always on the near future, and there is some reason to believe that Jesus expected the kingdom of heaven to come with power, the new social order to become manifest, in his own life-time. In fact he seems to have looked upon certain spiritual phenomena as indicating not only its approach but its actual presence. On the other hand, some of his parables apparently show that he did not expect a sudden and complete change of the world, but a gradual transformation. After all, the prophet is as clearly justified by the course of human events in looking for a sudden turning point in history, a judgment day upon things long undermined and ready to fall, a bursting forth of unexpected light, as he is forced by considerations of science to assume that the new will grow out of the old, and that the hour of birth will only reveal the life that has been

long hidden. From the cold scepticism that sees in history a meaningless play of social forces, questions the value of any social ideal, and doubts whether one course of conduct should be followed rather than another, men may well turn again to the prophet of Nazareth to rekindle their faith in themselves, in duty and in destiny.

A greater importance is given, in the teaching of Jesus, to the advent of the kingdom of heaven, the perfecting of human society, than to the future of the individual. This is an exceedingly significant fact. In his judgment, it was worth the while to live and to work, to suffer and to die, for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. No sacrifice, not even life itself, could be too great to hasten the coming of that heavenly society. He considered that in losing his life for what he conceived of as the highest good of the human race, a man in reality gained his life. Jesus seems to have hoped for himself and for those who should be accounted worthy of a resurrection from the dead a conscious, sexless, angel-like life beginning immediately after death. But his allusions to the fate of the individual are very few and of contested interpretation. It is perhaps possible to discern a conception of man's destiny beyond, developed at a time when Jewish eschatology was still in a fluctuating state, with a considerable degree of independence, but under the influence of surviving animistic ideas and a modified form of the Persian doctrine of a resurrection. On the other hand, Jesus dwells repeatedly and at length upon the coming kingdom of heaven, the social life that was to be, whose laws were binding upon the sons of the kingdom. Essentially this is the temper of hosts of men and women to-day, who are willing to live and strive and suffer, as suffer they must, and die, if need be, for the hope that is in them of a better social order, marked by greater justice, kindness, intelligence, and beauty; who seek and find life for themselves, rich, glorious and satisfying, in spending it to bring about the highest good of all; and who maintain a calm and cheerful mood in the presence of the mystery of death, persuaded that whatever survives, and in whatever form, of

physical force or spiritual energy, will continue to serve the high ends of existence to which life's work was devoted.

The supremacy of the ethical sense in Jesus is seen also in his peculiar religious attitude. Like the great prophets of his people he seems to have discarded the sacrificial cult, and he certainly looked with distrust upon all ritualistic performances, while he occasionally expressed his thought in spontaneous acts of symbolism. Unlike them, he never seems to have claimed mantic inspiration. None of his utterances has an oracular form. He did not speak in the name of Yahwe; he spoke for himself. He expressed his own convictions, and knew that they came from his own mind. Though a mystic, he does not appear to have been subject to fits of ecstasy or similar psychopathic conditions. He put no emphasis upon doctrinal belief. He judged men by their deeds rather than by their creeds. He did not qualify his approval of the good Samaritan by lamenting his heresy. But he esteemed the righteous inner disposition higher than the correct outward act, and regarded neither as meritorious. His God was not a task-master driving his slaves upon the earth, nor an employer of labor paying so much wages for so many hours of work, nor a director of a penitentiary punishing with so many stripes the sins of each culprit, but a father, just and kind, seeking by the best means the education and welfare of his children. Speculations upon the nature of the divine being seem to have been alien to his spirit. He would have been utterly bewildered by the Nicene creed. With all his heart he believed in the Good Spirit; but it was the moral perfection of his heart's ideal that attracted him. He longed to be like unto The Highest. Such a leader can only be welcomed by the many who have grown weary of sacramental magic, genuflexions and processions, ablutions and libations, infallible oracles and infallible priests, strange psychic experiences and wranglings over creeds, salvation by good deeds or orthodox professions, sales of indulgences and merits of the saints, fear of an angry God, and worship of an ignoble character. Such a guide is greatly needed by the many who have yet to

learn that man cannot live by bread alone, but that by walking in the path of duty, by following the vision of truth, and by seeking and loving The Highest shall man live; that, however the conventional standards may vary, our sense of obligation points to cosmic laws; that failure of adjustment is responsible for the impression of arbitrary power and irrationality in nature, which disappears with the growing light and strength and rectitude of man; that the deepest secret of the infinite life in which we are imbedded can never be known to a finite being, but that the pure in heart may approach it and, in reverent contemplation, find a peace which passes understanding.

Thus the thought of Jesus may, in numerous directions, become a stronger force in the life of the world than it has yet been. But far more potent than his word is his wonderful personality. It cannot be defined; names and titles utterly fail to do justice to it. Its subtle influence cannot be explained; it can only be felt. The hearts of men burn within them, when he talks with them in the road. When he breaks to them the bread of life, their eyes are opened; and though he vanishes from their sight, they can never forget him. To have once come under his spell, is to be his forever. To know him, is to love him.

It is an encouraging sign of the times that Israel, scattered among the nations, is beginning to appreciate the greatest of the prophets it has given to the human race. Some degree of acquaintance with his life and thought already exists among other non-Christian peoples. But it is very imperfect. In Asia and Africa there are hundreds of millions who have no knowledge of him. The leading representatives of the great missionary religions of the East, Buddhism and Islam, have as yet taken little interest either in studying the life and teachings of Jesus, or in encouraging their people to do so. The reasons are in part religious and in part political. They are under the impression that the true interests of the prophets whom they revere would suffer from a wide-spread knowledge of Jesus. In this they are quite mistaken. Those who have set before men

high ideals, raised their standards of morality, and inspired to noble conduct, have labored in a common cause. Gautama and Muhammad and every other prophet of the soul will be more truly honored and better understood by the nations to whom their names are dear, when Jesus of Nazareth shall be known and loved by them as well. There is more justification for the feeling that the spread of Christianity may be a peril to their political independence and peculiar organization of society. But the exclusion of the thought of Jesus will not obviate this danger. For it is not responsible for the martial spirit and the commercial greed too characteristic of the so-called Christian nations. Thoughtful Brahmins, Buddhists, Muhammadans, and adherents of other forms of religion in the East should learn to distinguish between the things that Jesus stood for and the things taught and practised in his name, and also to make a distinction between the messages of their own prophets and the beliefs and customs to which their names have been forced to give sanction. There is much in the social life and the political institutions of the races living outside the pale of Christendom which is harmful and doomed to perish with the advance of civilization. Those who rightly love and cling to what is noblest in their ancestral faith should gratefully avail themselves of the added strength and light a knowledge of Jesus would give in the common conflict against error and wrong. Christian missionaries are endeavoring to make Jesus known throughout the earth. So far as they bring with them his spirit, they cannot fail to accomplish their noble end. But they frequently conceive it to be their mission to wean the affections of men away from the prophets whom they have loved, to root up and destroy one form of religious life in order to establish another form. This is a grievous error. A missionary should be careful first to take out the beam of formalism that is in his own eye in order to be better fitted to take out the mote that is in his brother's eye.

The contact between different races, nations and classes of men grows closer every day. Elements of civilization,

creating a community of interests, are constantly diffused. Isolation becomes increasingly difficult. Strong moral and intellectual forces at work anywhere in the world quickly become operative over wide areas. Large bodies of men are bending their efforts, consciously and determinedly, to the realization of social ideals that seem to them desirable. The currents of human life point to changes, political and economic, social and religious, compared with which the revolutions of the past will seem insignificant. Prophets are heard announcing, in strident tones, the judgment that will come upon a world where are the slayers and the slain, the oppressors and their victims, the impostors and their dupes, the self-indulgent and the needy. There are also seers who proclaim visions of good things to come, corn and oil and wine, short hours of labor, rich amusements, pleasant homes, long life and numerous offspring. Both classes are needed. But in the ages that lie before us men will learn to listen, with a deeper gratification, to the great prophet of Nazareth who, in the fullness of time, went forth to proclaim as good news the coming of the kingdom of heaven to earth as a reign of righteousness, mercy and truth.

EXCURSUS A

GNOSTICISM

The importance of this great movement was first appreciated by Gottfried Arnold whose *Kirchen- und Ketzergeschichte* (1699-1700) treated the Gnostics with unprecedented sympathy and fairness. Massuet, in his edition of Irenaeus (1710), abandoned at least the patristic explanation of Gnostic heresy as due to moral depravity and hostility to the Christian religion, though he characterized the Gnostics as "fanatics." Mosheim also spoke of them as "fanatics," but earnestly endeavored to understand their thought as an expression of Oriental philosophy (*Kezergeschichte,* 1748). Semler significantly compared them with theosophists like Boehme and Dippel (*Einleitung zu Baumgarten's Untersuchungen,* 1771, p. 119). Neander, in his *Genetische Entwicklung der vornehmsten gnostischen Systeme,* (1818), traced Gnosticism to Philo, while Lewald (*De doctrina gnostica,* 1818), looked for Zoroastrian influences. A most important contribution to the study of Gnosticism was Baur's *Die christliche Gnosis,* (1835). Our knowledge of one important source was advanced by the researches of Bunsen (*Hippolytus and his age,* 1852), Volkmar (*Hippolytus und die römischen Zeitgenossen,* 1855), and Lipsius (*Der Gnosticismus* in Ersch und Grubers *Encyklopedie,* 1860). Heinrici undertook a careful study of the Valentinian system (*Die Valentinianische Gnosis,* 1871). Hilgenfeld presented, in his *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums,* (1884), what is known from patristic accounts in an admirable manner. New light has been thrown by the discovery of some of their own writings, notably the *Pistis Sophia,* translated into English by Mead (1898), the *Books of Je'u* published by Carl Schmidt in *Texte und Un-*

tersuchungen, VIII, and other works preserved in the Coptic, and a collection of Gnostic hymns in the Syriac. Harnack, in his *Dogmengeschichte* (1886-1890) and *Chronologie der altchristlichen Literatur* (1897), bases his appreciation upon these as well as upon the patristic testimony.

Friedländer has sought to establish a Jewish origin for Gnosticism (*Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus,* 1898) and has rendered it probable that the Ophites and other sects had a pre-Christian origin; but his attempt to prove that the Talmudic *Minim* are Gnostics rather than Christians and that the *gilyonim* are diagrams like the one described by Celsus rather than "gospels" must be regarded as a failure. While the contention of the Tübingen school that the apostle Paul was caricatured by Jewish Christians under the masque of Simon Magus still holds true, there is at present a tendency to assume that Simon actually existed and exercised an influence in shaping the Gnostic movement. The philosopher Kreyenbühl, who looks to Gnosticism for the salvation of the modern world, regards the *Apophasis Megale,* or Great Revelation, found in the *Philosophumena* of Hippolytus, as a genuine work of Simon, and the Fourth Gospel as a work of his disciple Menander of Kapparetaea (*Das Evangelium nach der Wahrheit,* 1900). Either assumption seems to be untenable. But the sympathetic study of Gnosticism by this thinker cannot fail to be productive of good results. Delff, in his *Geschichte des Rabbi Jesu von Nazara* (1889), assuming a large part of the Fourth Gospel to come from an eye-witness, the presbyter John, maintained that Jesus himself was a Gnostic. Hönig (*Die Ophiten,* 1889) called attention to some indications of Jewish Gnosticism likely to be older than the appearance of the Ophites as a Christian sect.

W. Anz made an important contribution to the study of Gnosticism (*Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnosticismus,* 1897), by pursuing the central idea of the ascent of the soul and the important cultic performance of baptism back to Babylonian conceptions and practices. He was

aided by the publication in recent times of numerous religious texts from different periods of Babylonian history and especially by Brandt's translations of Mandaic texts. The Mandaeans are the only known pagan Gnostic sect, but it is no easy task to separate the early stratum in the Genza and the Qolasta, not yet affected by a superficial knowledge of Judaism and Christianity, from the later parts. There is no doubt that Anz is right in assuming a dominant influence of Babylonian speculation in the formation of Gnosticism. He admits an additional Persian element. But the close relations between India and Bactria must not be overlooked. With a strong missionary religion then flourishing in India, its influence upon the types of religious thought in the Parthian empire cannot be questioned.

Grill has forcibly argued that Indian thought had much to do with the origin of Gnosticism (*Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums,* 1901). It is evident that the great Gnostic systems of the second century were the products of ideas and tendencies of thought, of different provenience and age, existing in the Hellenistic world before it came in contact with Christianity; but the historian is not justified in assuming the existence of a Valentinian system before Valentinus or in overlooking the later coloring given to the thought of great teachers by their disciples and the distortion of their statements in the reports of their enemies.

EXCURSUS B

THE COLLEGIA VICENTINA

Wiszowazzi, a grandson of Fausto Sozzini, relates in his *Narratio compendiosa*, written before 1678 and published as an appendix to Sand's *Bibliotheca antitrinitariorum* (1684), that about the year 1546 religious meetings were held in Vicenza, near Venice, attended by circa forty members, at which the doctrine of the Trinity was questioned. Among the participants he mentions Lelio Sozzini, Giulio (Gherlandi) of Treviso, and Francesco (Segga) of Rovigo. Sand himself, who may have had access to further sources or made larger excerpts from the Biography of Lelio, mentions, besides these three, Bernardino Ochino, Nicolao Paruta, Valentino Gentile, Francesco Negri, Paolo Alziati, and others. Lubieniecky, in his *Historia reformationis Polonicae*, 1685, pp 38 ff., tells substantially the same story. While maintaining that this family tradition contains a historic nucleus, Treschel (*Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier*, 1844, II, 391 ff.) thought that the questions said to have been discussed at Vicenza had not at that time been raised, but represented later "Socinian" speculation.

The discovery of the document of the Inquisition in Venice (see pp. 19, 137) puts these famous *Collegia Vicentina* in an entirely new light. It is seen that numerous Baptist churches in Italy and Switzerland cherished views concerning the person of Jesus far more radical than those held by the later Socinians. Well known reformers, like Curione, Negri and Camillo, not hitherto suspected of being Baptists, are found to have been members of these churches. Discussions of precisely the kind intimated by Wiszowazzi had apparently gone on for some time in the Baptist churches of Italy, when the Council was held. The prevailing type of

doctrine was that of the churches in Switzerland which had adopted Denck's position, while the influence of Servetus was less marked. And some of the participants in the Vicentine gatherings appear again four years later at the Council of Vicenza. There is no reason to doubt that there was a Baptist church at Vicenza in 1546, or that it was occupied then with questions concerning the person of Jesus. The only serious difficulty about Wiszowazzi's account is the presence of Ochino. We know that he was appointed preacher to the Italians in Augsburg in December, 1545, and that he escaped from the city during the siege in January, 1547. Unless it be supposed that he went to Ferrara and Venice in 1546, which is not wholly impossible, was invited by his friends to the meetings of the Baptists, and returned again to Augsburg, his presence must be seriously doubted. It is also noticeable that in his published works he never can be said to question the Trinity, though he is persistently charged with anti-trinitarian views. Yet his last defense of the orthodox doctrine is weaker than one would expect from a man of his ability, when speaking his mind freely and setting forth deep-seated convictions. Concerning Lelio Sozzini himself, we know that he was in Venice in 1546.

EXCURSUS C

THE RESURRECTION

The later narratives (Luke xxiv, John xx, Mark xvi, 9-20) describe appearances of Jesus after death to his eleven disciples in Jerusalem. An earlier tradition knows of no such appearances in that city. According to Matth. xxviii, 16-20 it was in Galilee he was first seen by his disciples. Mark's account is a torso. But the angel announces that Jesus will appear to his disciples and Peter in Galilee. In the Gospel of Peter 58 ff. the appearance can occur nowhere else than in Galilee, though the text breaks off before it is described. That the authors of Matthew and Mark should have passed by these appearances to the disciples in Jerusalem on the third day as unworthy of record, if they had ever heard of them, is quite inconceivable. Luke's account of the two disciples of Emmaus and his casual allusion to an appearance to Simon are not supported by John, while his description of the appearance of Jesus to "the eleven and those who were with them," his leading them out to Bethany and his ascension to heaven from that place on the third day differs widely from John's narrative of the appearances of Jesus first to all the disciples except Thomas but to no other persons with them, on the third day after his death, and then, one week later, to all the disciples including Thomas. While our two earliest gospels reveal no knowledge of any such experiences on the part of the disciples in Jerusalem, Luke makes no mention of any appearances of Jesus in Galilee, either on a mountain (as Matth. xxviii, 16) or at the sea (as Peter 60 and the appendix to the Fourth Gospel, John xxi, 1 ff.) Luke's attitude can be readily accounted for, as the earlier appearances in Jerusalem must have seemed to him far more important than the later one

in Galilee. The same is probably true of the author of the longer appendix to Mark. The editor of the Fourth Gospel felt that for completeness sake this should be added, especially as his version gave an opportunity of presenting the relative importance of Peter and John. Hence the addition of xxi, 1-23.

Already Matthew and Mark are familiar with the tradition that some women had found the tomb of Jesus empty and had been told by angels to inform his disciples that he would go before them into Galilee. The women, the angels, and the empty sepulchre appear also in the later gospels, but the appointment of a meeting in Galilee has disappeared. Characteristic of the freedom with which the earlier accounts were treated by later writers is the change of Matthew: "Tell his disciples . . . . he goes before you into Galilee" (xxviii, 7) into Luke's "Remember he spoke to you when he was yet in Galilee" (xxiv, 6). Concerning the events at the tomb there is the most bewildering difference of statements. There is no agreement as to who the women were (Mary Magdalene, Mary Magdalene and another Mary, the two Marys and Salome, or the two Marys and Joanna); and whether they were alone or accompanied by Peter and John on a second visit; when they started out (on Saturday night or Sunday morning); why they went (to view the sepulchre or to anoint Jesus with spices); whether the tomb had a military guard or not; whether one angel or two appeared; whether the angel sat on the stone outside or sat within the tomb; what the angel or angels said; whether or not Jesus himself appeared to the women; and whether or not the women reported what they had seen. No careful historian would feel justified in drawing from these confused, contradictory and mutually exclusive stories the inference that a tomb closed with a heavy stone into which Jesus had been laid was by some women found to be empty on the third day. Schmiedel, in his admirable discussion of the *Resurrection and Ascension Narratives* in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, goes so far as to see in Mark's statement "they said nothing to any one" an admission that the

story of the empty sepulchre was a novelty first introduced by himself. But the bearing of this phrase depends upon what followed it in the original Mark. It is difficult to believe that the author who recorded a solemn injunction to the women by an angel to deliver a most important message from the risen Master should have wished to leave the impression that they not only failed immediately to carry the good news to the disciples but never communicated their marvelous experience until he came into possession of the facts and proclaimed them. Harnack (*Bruchstuecke des Evangeliums des Petrus,* 1893, p. 33) thinks that Peter 58-60 was taken from the original ending of Mark, and in this he may be right. But the women are not instructed in the Gospel of Peter to give any message to the disciples. "And they said nothing to any one, for they were afraid" is probably an editorial gloss, introduced after the present close of the gospel (vss 9-20) had been added, having for its purpose to explain why the disciples did not go to Galilee but remained in Jerusalem to see their risen Lord there.

Matth. xxviii undoubtedly contains much late material. The last verses have clearly been worked over, MSS. used in the fourth century still containing a simpler, non-trinitarian form of the baptismal formula; vss 9 and 10 are generally recognized as late interpolations; vss 11-15 are probably also later than 1-8, 16, and vs 17 has the appearance of being secondary. In some respects Matth. xxviii, 1-8 seems more original than Mark xvi, 1-8. There is a distinct advance from the more natural visit to see the tomb on Saturday night immediately after the Sabbath had ended to the visit on the following morning with spices to anoint the body of Jesus; the number of women is increased in Mark; the coming of an angel to roll away the heavy stone and seating himself upon it is far more natural than his sitting within the tomb and being discovered there; "the Nazarene" is added in Mark; Peter is mentioned in addition to the other disciples in Mark; to avoid repetition Mark omits in vs 7 an essential part of the message "he is risen from the dead;" Mark changes "Behold, I have told you"

into "as he said to you." On the other hand, Matth. xxviii, 4 is occasioned by the story of the watch which appears to be a late insertion. Unfortunately, we have no means of knowing whether the original Aramaic gospel contained the story of the empty sepulchre.

As for the fulfilment of the angel's promise that Jesus should show himself to his disciples in Galilee, Matthew describes an appearance which took place on a mountain there, the eleven disciples seeing him and worshiping, though some doubted, while the appendix to John relates how Jesus showed himself to seven disciples at the Sea of Tiberias, and the Gospel of Peter likewise sets out to record an appearance at the sea, though Andrew and Levi who are especially mentioned in Peter are not referred to in John xxi. Here again there is an advance from "the eleven disciples" in Matth. to the emphasis upon Peter in John xxi and Peter 60, possibly also from the apparition before whom the disciples prostrate themselves in Matth. to the Lord who eats bread and fish with his "little children" in John xxi.

It is doubtful whether critical students would have been inclined to assume a kernel of historic truth in Matth. xxviii, 16 ff. if it had not been for I Cor. xv, 3-8. The account given in this passage differs from all others especially in two respects: it seems to assume that the appearances of Jesus to his immediate disciples were of the same character of celestial visions as those of Paul and it gives an enumeration of such visions apparently intended to be exhaustive which by its exclusions, inclusions and order distinguishes it in a marked degree from the gospels. Jesus is said to have appeared first to Cephas, then to the twelve, then to five hundred brethren at once, then to James, then to all the apostles, and finally to Paul as to one born too early. That the last phrase, wholly inapplicable in its ordinary sense, can only be explained by a reference to its meaning in the Valentinian system of Gnostic thought, was first seen by Straatman (*Kritische Studien,* II, 196 ff.) who was led to reject the whole passage as spurious. Brandt (*Evangelische Geschichte,* 1893, p. 414 ff.) recognizes the correctness of

Straatman's observation on the meaning of *ektroma,* but deems it sufficient to regard this word as a later gloss, and to assume that vss. 3-7 constitute an earlier account quoted by Paul. Schmiedel (*l. c.*) thinks that Paul received this information when he visited Jerusalem three years after his conversion. Either assumption is exposed to grave difficulties. If already within a decade or two after the death of Jesus a tradition concerning the number and order of his post-mortem appearances had fixed itself so firmly in apostolic circles in Jerusalem as to take the shape of a creed preached and believed, it is not easy to account for the development of our greatly divergent gospel narratives. The elements of faith that are allowed to drop are as remarkable as the elements added. An appearance of Jesus to five hundred brethren is permitted to vanish completely; an appearance to James, the brother of Jesus, disappears everywhere except in the Gospel of the Hebrews where it occurs in a highly legendary form at least in the days of Jerome; an appearance to the twelve which, if the text is sound, would include Matthias who was elected to take the place of Judas is passed by; an appearance to all the apostles, by which in distinction from the twelve a larger circle of missionaries is likely to be intended, is likewise eliminated, even the appearance to Peter is no longer deemed worthy of more than a passing allusion. Of even greater importance than this abandonment of testimony to the appearances of Jesus himself is the change of emphasis. The gospels put the most stress upon the appearance of angels at the empty tomb announcing the resurrection, and from this starting-point go on to narrate the manifestations of the Master who has come out of the tomb with flesh and bones, increasing their emphasis and wealth of details as they are further removed from the time of Jesus. Is it probable that Matthew should have deliberately slighted the tradition current in the mother-church, stamped with the authority of the apostles, and handed over from Jerusalem to the Gentile churches, and instead of this taken his stand upon the report of some women that they had seen an angel and found the tomb

empty? And is it likely that no subsequent evangelist should have come upon this tradition or deemed it worthy of serious attention? Can it be supposed that authors who set such store by the visions of angels actually were prejudiced against "mere visions" of the risen Messiah? These questions become especially pertinent, if it is assumed that an epistle containing this original apostolic tradition had for half a century or more been in circulation among those for whom the gospels were written. That every evangelist should have "happened" to overlook one of the earliest Christian classics, is a somewhat hazardous supposition. The more closely the account in I Cor. xv, 3-8 is examined, the more clearly its peculiar features point to a comparatively late date, when "the twelve disciples" were the object of much reverence, the term "apostles" designated a larger body, as in the Didache, facts gleaned from different sources were joined together into brief creedal statements, the tendency to extend over a long period the appearances of Jesus was marked, and at least in some circles the accounts of such appearances were interpreted as referring to visions of a heavenly figure, in harmony with a peculiar view of the character of the celestial body possessed by those who are brought from death into eternal life.

When the character of this passage is scrutinized, the theory that the belief in the resurrection of Jesus originated in visions loses its strongest support. While it is by no means improbable that the nervous tension caused by the daily expectation of his return as the Messiah here and there led to genuine ecstatic experiences in which his face was seen and his voice was heard, the documentary evidence of such visions is not sufficient. Nor could such visions have produced the conviction that he had risen from the dead on the third day. That conviction was engendered by faith in the prophetic word and in its application to Jesus. It was probably in Galilee that the disciples began to proclaim their earnest conviction that Jesus had risen from the dead according to the Scriptures and would soon return to them. The expectation of such a return of a dead ruler or teacher

is not an uncommon phenomenon in history. With dread or hope the people looks for a Nero, Charlemagne, or Barbarossa to come back from long, mysterious concealment. The expected reappearance of some dead Imam or Mahdi is a constant source of anxiety to the Muhammadan authorities. If in some such instances the belief has been that the heroes in reality never died, a quite miraculous preservation is always assumed, and at bottom the early belief in the case of Jesus was not very different. God would not allow his holy one to see corruption, or hand his soul over to Sheol. Before the soul had finally left the body, reanimation had taken place, and the suspended life was miraculously continued. As long as the place where they had lain him was unknown, there was no motive for further speculation about his resting-place. He was not there, he was risen. But when a fulfilment was sought for the prophecy in Isa. liii, 9 that the Servant of Yahwe should "have his tomb with the wicked and be with the rich in his death," interest in his tomb would naturally develop. When the desire to know what had happened at this tomb had once awakened, the growth of legend could not be stopped. And this is likely to have occurred at an early date. At first the assurance of an angel on the third day that he had risen and would be seen in Galilee sufficed. Then faith demanded that he should have been seen on that very day in the vicinity of the tomb. Gradually the thought seems to have grown familiar that during a longer period he had often come back to convince and instruct his disciples for their world-mission, while the outward form of his appearing would naturally be conceived in harmony with the more materialistic or more spiritual idea entertained of the resurrection body. But as the ultimate cause of this entire development was the ineradicable impression of the personality of Jesus, so each step reveals something of the growing sense of his worth and attachment to his cause.

INDEX

I. INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Abba! 33, 153, 154, 361.
Abel's sacrifice, 54, 58.
Adam, 39, 57.
Ablutions, 60, 275, 379.
Abraham, numen of Hebron, 40, 54, 57.
  his sacrifice, 54, 59.
  his seed, 37, 40, 41.
Acts of the Apostles, 185-187.
  of John, 170-185.
  of Paul and Thecla, 185.
  of Peter, 170.
Adapa, 119.
Adoptionism, 136.
Advent, second,
  of dead prophets, 46.
  of translated heroes, 83.
  of Jesus, 321.
Akiba, Rabbi, 89.
Albigenses, 136.
Allegorical method, 7, 12.
Alexander the Great, 245, 249.
Alexander Balas, 76.
Alexander Jannaeus, 66.
Alziati, Paolo, 137, 390.
Alogi, 160, 207.
'Anani' "the Man on the Clouds" 130.
Angel of the Covenant, 54, 63.
Angels, degraded gods, 63.
Animal sacrifices, 59.
Anointing of kings, 71.
Antiochus Epiphanes, 55, 63, 75.
Antichrist, 64.
Antitype, 36.
Apophasis Megale, 388.
Aramaic Gospel, 205, 218, 219, 220, 223, 228, 230, 231, 232.
Aramaic Targums, 3, 90, 91, 166, 167, 229.
Aramati, 45, 67.
Arianism, 16.
Aristobulus I., 73.
Aristobulus II., 71.
Ark of the Covenant, 60.
Arminianism, 22.
Arnauld, Antoine, 333.
Astrological view of the world, 65, 243 ff.
Assumption of Moses, 82.
Avatars, 213.

Babylonian mythology, 118.
Balaam's curse, 37, 41.
Balder, 17.
Banus, 86, 256.
Baptism, 53, 56, 60, 222, 257, 259, 261, 313, 316, 379.
Baptists, 19, 22, 136 ff, 160, 207, 326, 329, 331, 390, 391.
Barbarossa, 398.
Bar Elaha, 145.
Barnabas, 187, 200.
Bar 'nasha, 107, 111, 112, 114, 115, 117, 120, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 133.
Bar nefele, 130.
Baruch, Apocalypse of, 83, 184.
Basilides, 15, 211.
Bathsheba, 68.

Bau, 82.
Begotten 'God' or 'Son,' 13, 14
Bene Elohim, 142, 143.
Ben-Sotada, 250, 251.
Bereh-de-gabra, 127, 128, 130.
Bereh de-'nasha, 127, 128.
Bereh de-bar 'nasha, 127, 128.
Beth Ephrathah, 38, 46.
Bethsaida, 266.
Bhagavadgita, 347.
Bogh, Slavonic divinity, 17.
Biandrata, Giorgio, 137.
Boethusians, 182.
Brethren of the Free Spirit, 136.
Brethren of the United Life, 136.
Buddhism, 384, 385.
Bythos, 170.

Caiaphas, 286, 287.
Cain-Kenites, 58.
Calvin, estimate of, 328, 329.
Camillo Renato, 390.
Canaan, curse of, 37.
Canticles, character of, 38, 45.
Capernaum, 263, 267, 268, 270, 276, 278.
Catholic Epistles, 191-193.
Cerinthus, 160, 247, 250.
Chaamu-Venus, 83.
Chalazath-Venus, 83.
Charlemagne, 398.
Chorazin, 266.
Chrestus, 178.
Christ-conception, 3, 4, 7-9.
Christian experience, 5.
Christo-centric theology, 27.
Christus, 174, 177, 178.
Christiani, 177, 178.
Ciasca's *Diatessaron*, 208.
Circumcision, 55, 56.
Cities of refuge, 61.
Claude of Savoy, 137
Clementine Epistles, 187, 188.
Collegia Vicentina, 390, 391.
Conjunctio maxima, 243-245.
Cosmic moral laws, 359.
Cosmic year, 65.
Council of Venice, 19, 391.
Covenant, the new, 38, 53.
Creed-making, 1, 2, 11, 30.
Criticism of Jesus, 32.
Crusades, 324.
Curione, Celio Secundo, 390.
Cyrus, Yahwe's King, 47, 74.

Daniel's 'Son of man,' 38, 50, 85, 97, 100, 115, 118, 119, 128, 132.
Darius Hystaspis, 70.
David as a poet, 42.
"Davidic," or royal hymns, 69, 70.
"Davidic" prophecies, 37, 42, 43, 44.
David, Francis, 140.
Dedication, feast of, 66, 214.
Deification of men, 2, 3.
Deists, 21.
Dionysus, 14.
Deluge myth, 56.
Denck, estimate of, 329.
Didache, 183, 194.
Divinity of kings, 43, 44, 144.
Dusares, 83.

Easter, 54.
Ebionites, 16, 27, 91, 136, 182.
Ebionitish Acts of the Apostles, 185.
Ecclesiastes, 81.
Ecclesiasticus xliv ff, authorship of, 75.
Ektroma, 395, 396.
Eleazar, Bar Kozeba's associate, 90.
Elipandus of Toledo, 136.
Elusa-Chalazath, 83.
Enoch, Ethiopic, 78, 79, 84, 85, 132.
Enoch, Slavonic, 81.
Ephod, 60, 61.
Erythraean Sibyl, 77.

Esau, 53, 58.
Essenes, 27, 86, 110, 254, 256, 323.
Eucharist, 53, 284, 285, 379.
Euhemerism, 3.
Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum, 128, 153, 219.
Evolution, doctrine of, 25, 28, 29, 66, 67.
Ezekiel's "Messianic" prophecies, 38, 49.
Ezra, Apocalypse of, 83, 117, 144, 145, 184.

Fatherhood of God, 152-155, 295.
Felix of Urgel, 136.
Fourth Gospel, 211 ff.
Fox, George, 333.
Francis of Assisi, 18.
Francke, August, 22.

Garden of Eden myth, 39.
Gentile, Valentino, 138.
Gherlandi, Giulio, 137, 390, 398.
Gilyonim, not diagrams, 388.
Giuliano of Milan, 330.
Gnosticism, 12, 15, 16, 133, 151, 160, 213, 214, 387-389.
Gnostic Acts of the Apostles, 185.
Gods having human offspring, 143, 249.
Gog and Magog, 91.
Gospel acc. to Matthew, 218 ff.
" " Mark, 224 ff.
" " Luke, 225 ff.
" " John, 207-217.
" " Peter, 206, 207.
" " Hebrews, 205, 206.
" " Ebionites, 206.
" " Egyptians, 206.
" " Nicodemus, 207.
Gribaldo, Matteo, 137.
Groote, Gerhard, 18.
Gula, 82.

Haetzer, Ludwig, 137.
Hagar, Arabian tribe, 53, 57.
Haggai's "desire of all nations," 39, 50.
Hammurabi's Code, 301, 370.
Hamon, Jean, 333.
Hasmonaean kings, 44, 68, 69.
Hegelian philosophy, 24.
Hellenism, 4, 200-204.
Herborn Bible, 21.
Hero-worship, 2.
Herod the Great, 241, 242, 243, 247.
Herod Antipas, 257 ff.
Herod Boethus, 266.
Herodias, 266.
Hesu, Keltish divinity, 17.
Hesychius, 13.
Hezekiah, 70.
Hillel, 355.
Hofmann, Melchior, 138.
Homoousion 17, 322.
Homoiousion, 322.
Hosea's prophecy of resurrection, 38, 45.
Hubal-Allah, 60.
Hyrcanus, son of Tobias, 30, 50.

Ignatian Epistles, 188-191.
Imitatio Christi, 325.
Immanuel, 47.
Indian influence, 169.
Invisible Church, 63.
Isaac, numen of Beersheba, 48, 57.
Isaiah's "Messianic" prophecies, 38, 46, 47.
Ishara, 82.
Ishtar, 57, 82.
Islam, 384.

James, Epistle of, 191.
Jacob, numen of Shechem, 40, 58.
Jacob of Kefar Sekanyah, 252.
Jason, the high-priest, 50, 71.
Japhet in Noah's curse, 40.
Jehoiachin, 69.

Jeremiah's "Messianic" prophecies, 38, 48, 49.
Jerome's "Hebrew" Gospel, 205.
Jesus,
born in Galilee, 240.
in the town of Nazareth, 243.
not in Bethlehem, 243, 246, 247.
not a Davidic descendant, 247, 248.
not illegitimate, 255.
son of Joseph and Mary, 240, 248.
probably 6 B. C., 240, 243 ff.
a carpenter, not a rabbi, 251, 252.
familiar with Hebrew Scriptures, 251.
especially attracted by the prophets, 252.
acquainted with Essenic thought, 254, 255.
influenced by John the Baptist, 259.
baptized, probably early in 29 A. D., 259-261.
alone in the wilderness, 262-263.
appearing as a prophet, 263.
claiming no mantic inspiration, 383.
curing diseases, 264, 265.
befriending the outcast, 268.
not an ascetic, 269.
rejecting Sabbath-laws, 269, 270.
gathering disciples, 270, 271.
preaching on the mount, 272, 273.
visited by Pharisees from Jerusalem, 274.
rejecting ablutions, 275.
breaking with O. T. tabus, 275.
going into exile, 276.
visiting Caesarea Philippi, 276.
rejecting Messiahship and all lordship, 277, 278, 280.
coldly received in Capernaum, 278.
criticising temple tax, 279.
going through Peraea, 279.
quietly entering Jerusalem, 281.
attacking the sacrificial cult, 282.
attacked by the Sadducees, 282.
rejecting dream of independence, 283.
anointed by a woman, 283, 284.
eating with his disciples, 284, 285.
praying in Gethsemane, 285.
arrested in the garden, 285.
tried by irregular session of Sanhedrin, 286.
delivered to Pilate by Caiaphas, 287.
delivered to the Jews by Pilate, 288.
probably neither mocked nor scourged, 288.
crucified by the Jews, 288, 289.
having his garments divided, 288.
relieved with wine and myrrh, 288.
uttering inarticulate cry, 288.
probably buried in Joseph's tomb, 290.
on a Friday, 14 Nisan, 291.
in some year between 29 and 36 A. D., 291.
exercising great post-humous influence, 319 ff.
through the impression of his life, 319.

through his death as a martyr, 318.
through his teaching, 319.
through the Messiahship ascribed to him, 319, 320.
through his deification, 322.
claiming present leadership, 360 ff.
as a seeker after truth, 361.
as a deep and earnest thinker, 361, 362.
as an artist, 362, 363.
as a social reformer, 364 ff.
having a message to the modern world, 354, 360 ff.
interested in its vital questions, 360 ff.
capable of inspiring and guiding, 360 ff.
uniting his influence with every upward tendency in the race, 385, 386.
Job's Redeemer, 37, 41, 42.
Jochanan ben Torta, 89.
Jochanan ben Zakkai, 182.
Joel's predictions, 38, 45, 46.
John, the Apostle
alleged residence in Ephesus, 209-211.
probable martyrdom in Palestine, 209-211.
epistles ascribed to, 191.
John the Baptist, 256 ff., 266, 267.
John, the Presbyter, 192, 210, 211.
Jonah as a sign, 38.
Jonathan, the high-priest, 71.
Joshua ben Hananiah, 182.
Joshua ben Jehozadak, 71.
Jozedek, the "shoot," 48.
Josephus
disciple of Banus, 86, 256.
acquainted with Messianic idea, 86, 87.
silent as to Christianity, 180, 181.
familiar with story of John the Baptist, 257, 258.
Jubilees, Book of, 82.
Judas, son of Ezekias, 87.
Judas, the Galilean, 87.
Judas Iscariot, 37, 43, 285, 286.
Jude, Epistle, 191, 192.

Ka-conception, 165
Kautz, Jacob, 137.
Kenites, 58, 59.
Kingdom of heaven, 32, 36, 295 ff., 323.
Kossuth, Louis, Bar Kozeba compared with, 90.

Labadie, Jean de, 22, 333.
Ladders for the gods, 63.
Legitimist tendencies, 72, 73.
Leontopolis, temple of, 76.
Levi, son of Alphaeus, 268.
Logos
mythical basis of, 161.
foreign influence on idea of, 161, 162.
in Greek thought, 163-166.
in Philo, 166-168.
in the Fourth Gospel, 159, 169-170, 213 ff.
in the Targums, 166, 167.
in Gnosticism, 170.
spermatikos, 165, 168, 172.
endiathetos, 165, 168, 171, 172.
prophorikos, 165, 168, 171, 172.
Logia Jesu, 170, 227.
Lollards, 136.
Loisy, A., 341.
Luke, origin and date of, 235 ff.
Luther, estimate of, 326, 327.

Machaerus, 266.
Magnificat, the, 250.
Marcion's Gospel, 225 ff.

Marcionites, 136.
Mark, origin and date of, 224 ff.
Marduk, 75, 118.
Martini, Rudolph, 137.
Mary Magdalene, 269.
Matthew, origin and date of, 221 ff.
Melchizedek, 57, 58, 153.
Melito, 210.
Memra, 166.
Menelaus, 50.
Menander of Kapparetaea, 211, 388.
Messiah ben Joseph, 91, 92.
Messiah,
  anointed by Elijah, 90.
  first reference in 60 B. C., 68 ff.
  translated Davidic descendant, 83.
Messianic prophecy,
  a misnomer, 51.
  thriving only in Palestine, 51.
  examined, 35-52.
Michael, 50, 75, 82, 118, 132.
Minim, 181, 388.
Missions, 324, 344, 345.
Modein, 46, 88.
Muhammadanism, 385.
Muratorianum, 184.
Mysticism, 18.

Naravana, 133.
Nazaraeans, 182.
Nebuchadnezzar, 55, 63.
Negri, Francesco, 137, 390.
Neo-Kantianism, 27.
Nehemiah, 72.
Nero, 398.
Neronic persecution, 177.
New moons, 62.
Ninib, 82.
Noah, Apocalypse of, 85.
Noetus, 16.
Noetians, 136.
Nominalism, 17, 18.

Panthera, 200.
Paraclete, 215.
Parthenogenesis, 249.
Paruta, Nicolao, 390.
Pagan references to Christianity, 174-179.
Parables of Enoch, 30, 85, 132,
Parables of Jesus
  lost coin, 228, 311.
  lost sheep, 228, 311.
  lost son, 288, 311.
  vineyard, 312.
  talents, 307.
  unjust steward, 307.
  sower, 308, 363.
  leaven, 308.
  mustard seed, 308.
  fishes, 308.
  plant, 309.
  Pharisee and Publican, 228, 313.
  Good Samaritan, 228, 363.
  Dives and Lazarus, 363.
  foolish virgins, 363.
  widow, 363.
  shepherd, 363.
Passagii, 136.
Passover, 52, 62, 214.
Pataliputra, 162.
Patarenes, 136.
Paul of Samosata, 16.
Paul of Tarsus,
  acquainted with Stoic thought, 202.
  representative of Helenism, 202.
  author of five extant Epistles, 195, 196 ff.
Paul and Seneca, 174 f.
Paulianists, 136.
Paulicians, 136.
Pauline Epistles, 193-204.
Pentecost, 54, 66.

Periodicity of history, 64-66.
Peter, Epistle of, 192, 193.
Pharao,—type of the devil, 55, 63.
Philo,
silence concerning Christianity, 179.
Messianic idea of, 81.
Logos-conception of, 166-168.
Pietism, 22, 23, 334, 335.
Pistis Sophia, 387.
Plan of salvation, 35, 36.
Pompey, 68.
Port-Royalists, 333.
Poverty, 352.
Priene-inscription, 144.
Prophets,
as soothsayers, 73, 74.
like Moses, 37, 41.
false and true, 73, 74.
Protestant Church, 341 ff.
Protevangel, 36.
Protevangelium Jacobi, 207.
Public utilities, 353.
Purusha, 133
Pythagoreanism, 255.

Quakerism, 22, 333, 334, 364.
Quirinius, 241.

Rachel's lament, 49.
Racine, Jean, 333.
Rationalism, 23, 24, 337.
Resurrection in general,
Pharisaic view of, 283.
Essene view of, 255.
Jesus' view of, 125, 255, 283, 384.
of prophets, 46.
of John the Baptist, 320.
of descendant of David, 83.
of many when Jesus died, 320.
not necessarily on last day, 320.
Resurrection of Jesus,
not predicted by him, 126.
not prophesied in the Scriptures, 42, 45, 320 f.
not historical, 320, 321, 392-398.
not believed because of empty tomb, 393.
not believed because of visions, 397.
believed because the Scriptures suggested, mythology allowed, and love demanded it, 320, 321, 397, 398.
Revelation of John, 184.
of Peter, 183.
of Paul, 183.
Revenants, 46, 83, 321.
Ritschlian School, 4, 27.
Rizzetto, Antonio, 137.
Roman Catholic Church, 340 f.
Royalist psalms, 43 f.

Sabellians, 136.
Sabbath, 54, 62, 95, 108, 109, 110, 111, 133, 269, 270, 313.
Sacraments, 53, 316.
Sacred days, 61, 62.
Sadducees, 182, 282, 283, 286, 289.
Samaritan in Tirathana, 87.
Samaritan Messiah, 87.
Samaritans called Sebastenes, 81.
Saoshyas, 80, 93.
Sarah 53, 57.
Sattler, Michael, 137.
Saturnalia, 62.
Science and the Church, 346 ff.
Scriptures,
authority of, 6.
known to Jesus, 252 f.
criticised by Jesus, 272, 273, 275, 278 f., 282, 300 f., 302, 304 f., 314, 318.
Servant of Yahwe, 48.
Segga, Francesco, 137, 390.

Sheshbazzar, 47, 69.
Shiloh, 37, 41.
Sibylline oracles, 76 f., 80 f.
Sige, 170.
Simon, the high-priest, 77.
Simon bar Kozeba, 82, 88, 116, 217.
Simon Magus, 81, 87, 211.
Sinai, 62.
Sin-apal-uzur, 47.
Slavery, 323, 351, 353.
Socrates and his School, 164.
Socialism, 32, 349, 350, 351, 354.
Society of Jesus, 321-323.
Socinianism, 22.
Son of David, 68.
Son of God,
second person in Trinity, 135.
figure of speech, 138 f., 141.
by physical birth, 143.
by accession to throne, 143, 144.
by translation or resurrection, 146.
known to the demons, 148 f.
alone knows the Father, 151 f.
not used at Caesarea, 149.
not used at the trial, 149 f.
not used by centurion, 150.
used by Jesus only in ethical sense, 141.
not used by Jesus of himself, 151, 152-154.
Son of Man,
in Ezekiel, 99.
in Daniel, 100, 116 f.
in Enoch, 110, 111.
in Jerome's gospel, 113.
in Canonical gospels, 121 ff.
not humanity by incarnation, 94.
not equivalent to "this man," 95.
not ideal humanity, 96 f.
not lowly humanity, 97 f.
not Messianic title, 98.
not used by Jesus in Greek, 130 f.
not created by Jesus in Aramaic, 99.
translation of *bar nasha*, 95 ff.
used by Jesus only in generic sense, 104 ff.
not used by Paul, 113.
not used in Revelation, 113.
not created by the evangelists, 102.
introduced through Greek version of Synoptic Apocalypse, 103, 105.
misunderstood in Greek rendering, 105.
fashioned into title, 105.
fused with Daniel's angel, 132.
fused with Gnostic ideas, 132 f.
made Jesus' self-designation, 133.
substituted for other expressions, 122 f.
variously rendered in Aramaic versions, 127 f., 130.
Star of Bethlehem, 242, 244.
Stoicism, 160, 165 f., 323.
Sunday, 62, 66.
Symbolic interpretation, 335-337.
Symbolum Nicaenum, 17.
Synoptic Apocalypse, 86, 184.
Synoptic Gospels, 217 ff., 230 ff., 232-259.

Tabernacles, feast of, 61, 214.
Tammuz, 14.
Ta'eb, 87.
Talmud on Jesus, 181-183.
Taxon, possibly Jehudah ben Baba, 82.
Teaching of Jesus,
on the kingdom of heaven,

295-300, 308 f., 382.
on the inner rectitude, 300 f.
on overcoming evil with good, 281, 285, 301, 364.
on the slaying of enemies, 300 f.
on the treatment of criminals, 301 f., 365 ff.
on oath-taking, 302 f., 368 f.
on royalty and authority, 303 f., 366 f.,
on marriage and divorce, 304, 369 ff.
on celibacy, 304, 372.
on private wealth, 305, 307, 374-378.
on sharing and lending, 305, 307, 315 f., 376.
on the law of increase, 307.
on the law of compensation, 311.
on the Perfect Being, 310-313, 383.
on the divine method, 311.
on the survival of the worthiest, 312, 382.
on ablutions, 275, 313, 379.
on tabus, 275, 313.
on Sabbath-keeping, 269, 313, 379.
on the sacrificial cult, 282, 313, 378, 383.
on public prayer, 313 f., 379.
on public fasting, 269, 314 f.
on public almsgiving, 315 f.
on taxation for religious purposes, 279, 379.
on asceticism, 269, 369.
not meant for a millennium, 305.
not provisional, 307 f.
not impracticable, 309 f.
neglected in the Ecumenic creeds, 293 f.
neglected by N. T. writers, 294 f.
helpful at the present time, 355, 360 ff.
Theodotion, 16.
Theodotians, 136.
Theologia Germanica, 18.
Therapeutae, 323.
Theudas, 87.
Tiamat, 118.
Tiridates, 246.
Tiziano, 137.
Travels of Peter, 185.
Travels of Paul, 185.
Travels of James, 185.
Travels of John, 185.
Two natures, 173.
Two-source theory, 227 ff.
Two Ways, the, 183.
Tübingen School, 24, 26, 141, 184 f., 196.
Typology, 35 f., 52-67.

Unitarianism, 4, 22.
Cf. Baptists
Universalism, 22.
Cf. Baptists
Upanishads, 347.
Urim and Thummim, 60.

Vahu Mano, 45.
Virgin birth, 38, 46 f., 135, 137, 139, 249, 250, 251.
Virgin Mary cult, 325.

Waldenses, 136.
War, 32, 330 ff., 334, 350 ff., 354, 357, 358.
We-source in Acts, 186, 226.
Weeks, feast of, 54, 62.
Williams, Roger, 22.
Wisdom, book of, 81.
"Wisdom of God," 14, 85, 86, 184, 232.
Wolfenbüttler Fragmente, 22.
Woman's emancipation, 353 f., 370, 374.

Yahwe's son, the king, 143.
Yaldabaoth, 82.

Zealots, 87.
Zechariah, son of Barachiah, 86, 185, 232.
Zechariah's "Messianic" prophecies, 39, 50 f.
Zerubbabel, 47, 50, 69 f.
Zir Amiluti, 119.
Zoe and *Logos*, 170.
Zoroastrian influence, 387.
Zwingli, estimate of, 326-328.

II. INDEX TO AUTHORS

Aal, Anathon, 163, 164, 166, 172.
Abbott, Ezra, 14.
Alford, Henry, 14.
Anaxagoras, 164.
Anz, W., 388.
Appel, H., 94.
Apuleius, 174.
Aristides, 183.
Aristo of Pella, 183.
Arnold, Gottfried, 334, 387.
Arrian, 60, 175.
Athanasius, 160, 172.
Athenagoras, 171, 183.
Augustine, 175.

Bacher, Wilhelm, 88.
Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, 208.
Baethgen, Friedrich, 83.
Baldensperger, Wilhelm, 29, 98, 106, 115.
Ballenstedt, G., 25.
Bardt, Karl Friedrich, 23.
Barnabas, 187.
Baudissin, Wolf, 83.
Bauer, Bruno, 22, 24, 101 f., 141, 167, 175, 185, 195 f., 202, 207.
Baur, Ferdinand Christian, 24, 97 f., 101, 141, 184, 194 f., 196, 207, 387.
Beck, J. T., 25.
Beer, Georg, 45, 79.
Benrath, Karl, 137.
Benzinger, Immanuel, 55.
Berkeley, George, 346.
Bertholdt, Ludwig, 91, 107.
Beurlier, E., 144.
Bevan, Anthony Ashley, 106, 114.
Beyschlag, Wilhelm, 97.
Beza, Theodor, 96.
Blount, Charles, 21.
Blumenbach, J. F., 25.
Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, 21.
Bolten, Johann Adrian, 95 f.
Bonfrère, Jacques, 20.
Boström, Jakob, 27, 347.
Bousset, Wilhelm, 13 f., 63, 81, 88, 129 f., 212, 323.
Bruston, C., 44.
Brahe, Tycho, 21.
Brandt, Wilhelm, 30, 60, 103, 150, 152, 252, 260, 389, 395.
Breasted, James H., 162.
Bretschneider, Karl Gottlieb, 101, 207.
Briggs, Charles Augustus, 27, 81.
Bruce, James, 117.
Brückner, W., 100.
Bruins, J. A., 103, 197.
Bruno, Giordano, 21, 140.
Budde, Karl, 48.
Buffon, G. L. L., 25.
Bunsen, C. K. J., 387.

Caldecott, W. Shaw, 61.
Calvin, John, 18, 189.
Cantú, Césare, 136.
Carlstadt, Andreas Bodenstein, 20, 193.
Carpenter, J. Estlin, 100.
Cary, G. L., 99.
Cassel, Paul, 250.

Cassels, W. R., 27, 208.
Castelli, E., 61.
Cellarius, Martin, 137.
Celsus, 12, 16, 90, 145, 179, 190, 208.
Charles, R. H., 30, 79, 81 f., 99, 106, 116.
Chateillon, Sebastian, 77, 328.
Chemnitz, Martin, 189.
Cheyne, Thomas Kelley, 27, 42, 45, 47, 72, 243, 256, 257, 271.
Chrysippus, 165.
Cleanthes, 165.
Clemen, Carl, 106, 120.
Clement of Alexandria, 105, 171, 205.
Clement of Rome, 187, 188.
Colani, T., 27.
Collins, Anthony, 21.
Comba, Emilio, 19, 137, 160, 207.
Conybeare, C. F., 148, 323.
Cone, Orello, 103.
Copernicus, Nicolas, 21.
Cureton, William, 189.
Curione, Celio Secundo, 137.
Cyprian, 259.

Dallaeus, Johannes, 189.
Dalman, Gustaf, 90, 106, 114 f., 144 f., 151, 250, 297, 309.
Darwin, Charles, 25.
Davidson, Samuel, 27.
Deissmann, G. A., 144.
Delff, Hugo, 388.
Denck, Hans, 19, 137 f., 139 f., 328 f., 391.
Denifle, F. H. S., 327.
De Wette, W. M. L., 24, 193, 196.
Diderot, Denis, 23.
Dieterich, A., 83, 246.
Dillmann, August, v, 25, 83.
Dio Cassius, 246.
Dio Chrysostom, 175, 323.
Diodorus Siculus, 55.
Dionysius of Corinth, 187.
Dippel, Conrad, 22, 335.
Dodge, Ebenezer, v.
Driver, Samuel R., 106, 122, 130 f.
Drummond, James, 106, 120, 144.
Duhm, Bernhard, 28, 42, 44, 50, 76 f.,
Dulk, Albert, 32.

Edelmann, August, 22, 140, 335.
Eerdmans, B. D., 30, 104, 105.
Eichhorn, Albert, 284.
Eichhorn, J. G., 25, 193, 199, 247.
Eliezer, Rabbi, 182.
Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 24, 347.
Empedocles, 164.
Epictetus, 175.
Epiphanius, 82 f., 160, 250, 260.
Erasmus, Desiderius, 18, 138.
Eusebius, 88, 181, 218, 257.
Evanson, E., 193, 196, 207.
Ewald, Heinrich, 25, 151.

Fairbairn, Patrick, 53.
Fénélon, François, 22.
Fichte, Immanuel Hermann, 346.
Fiebig, Paul, 106, 128.
Flacius, Matthias, 189.
Flemming, J., 116.
Freytag, G. A., 212.
Friedländer, M., 388.
Fries, Samuel, 208, 211.
Fritzsche, K. F. A., 96.

Galilei, Galileo, 21.
Geiger, Abraham, 48, 80.
Génébrard, Gilbert, 95..
George, J. F. L., 24.
George, the Sinner, 210.
Gerlach, E., 181.
Gfrörer, A. F., 163.
Gibbon, Edward, 323.
Gieseler, J. K. L., 180.
Ginzel, Friedrich Karl, 292.
Ginzberg, Louis, 83.
Goethe, Johann Wolfgang, 23.
Graf, Karl Heinrich, 26..
Gramberg, C. P. W., 24.

Grill, Julius, 50, 163, 169, 208, 389.
Grossmann, C. G. L., 168.
Grotius, Hugo, 95, 138, 193.
Gunkel, Hermann, 63, 106, 118, 184.
Guyon, Jeanne Marie, 22.

Hackmann, H., 47.
Haeckel, Ernst, 25.
Hadrian, 178.
Halévy, Joseph, 242.
Harnack, Adolph, 13, 105, 113, 175, 184, 193, 206 f., 208, 212, 250, 388, 394.
Harper, Robert Francis, 370.
Harris, J. Rendel, 250.
Hartmann, Eduard, 347.
Hase, Karl, 26.
Hasenclever, A. H. F., 176.
Hausrath, Karl, 87, 99.
Hävernick, K. F., 25.
Heath, Richard, 19.
Heberle, K., 137.
Hegel, G. W. F., 24, 336, 346.
Hegesippus, 183, 188.
Hengstenberg, E. W., 25, 53.
Henke, C. F., 25.
Heinrici, G., 387.
Heinze, J. M., 163.
Heracleon, 208.
Heraclitus, 160, 163, 164.
Herbert of Cherbury, 140.
Herder, J. G., 23, 96.
Herrmann, Wilhelm, 27.
Hermas, 183, 184.
Herodotus, 55.
Heuzey, Léon, 55.
Hilgenfeld, Adolph, 26, 77, 98, 106, 113, 127, 196, 207, 241, 387.
Hilgenfeld, Rudolph, 241.
Hillmann, J., 148, 250.
Hippolytus, 171, 388.
Hitzig, Ferdinand, 100.
Hoekstra, S., 100.
Hofmann, J. C. K., 25, 100.
Hollmann, G., 196.
Holsten, Karl, 98, 195, 196.
Holtzmann, H. J., 13, 97, 101 f., 123, 196, 207, 258.
Holtzmann, Oskar, 13, 259.
Hommel, Fritz, 57, 119.
Hönig, W., 388.
Horst, G. C., 207, 336.
Hort, F. J. A., 13, 14.
Houbigant, Charles François, 21, 138.
Hubmaier, Balthasar, 19, 328.
Hulsius, Anton, 52.
Hume, David, 21.
Huxley, Thomas, 25.
Huyghens, Christian, 21.

Ibn Ezra, Abraham, 18, 100.
Ibn Hisham, 71.
Ignatius, 170, 187-191.
Ilgen, D. F., 140.
Irenaeus, 171, 208, 242.

Jacobsen, August, 102.
Jansen, Cornelius, 333.
Jehudah, Rabbi, 181.
Jensen, Peter, 56, 82.
Jeremias, Alfred, 119.
Jerome, 113, 175, 205, 259.
Joel, Marcus, 182, 197.
Joris, David, 138.
Jose bar Zabda, 181.
Josephus, 31, 86 f., 179 f., 181, 241, 252, 258, 303 f., 318.
Jülicher, A., 123, 124, 152.
Julius Africanus, 88.
Justin Martyr, 90, 171, 183, 290.
Justus of Tiberius, 181.
Juvenal, 175.

Kalthoff, A., 197.
Kant, Immanuel, 23, 336, 347.
Keil, C. F., 25.
Keim, Theodor, 26, 137, 181, 242.
Keller, Ludwig, 19.

Kepler, Johann, 244, 245.
Kirkegaard, Sören, 27.
Kittel, Rudolph, 68.
Klöpper, A., 106, 120, 151.
Koch, A. (Opsopaeus), 77.
Köhler, Kaufmann, 155.
Kreyenbühl, Johannes, 208, 211, 388.
Krop, E. J., 106, 117.
Kuenen, Abraham, 26, 28, 74.
Kuinoel, C. T., 96.

Lagarde, Paul de, 30, 103, 104.
Lamarck, J. B. P. A., 25.
Lawrence, Richard, 117.
Leclerc, Jean, 22.
Lessing, G. E., 22 f.
Lévy, Jacob, 91.
Lewald, J. K. A., 387.
Lietzmann, Hans, 30, 105, 114, 116.
Lightfoot, G. B., 194.
Lindgren, H. G., 27.
Lipsius, Richard A., 83, 105, 387.
Locke, John, 22, 140.
Loman, A. D., 181, 185, 197.
Lubieniecky, Stanislas, 390.
Lucian of Samosata, 179, 190.
Lucius, P., 255.
Ludolph, Senior, 136.
Luther, Martin, 18, 326, 327.
Lyra, Nicolas de, 94.

Madden, F. W., 88.
Malalas, Johannes 190.
Manchot, C. H., 175.
Manelfi, 136, 137.
Marcion, 15, 112, 193.
Marcus Aurelius, 178, 190.
Marquart, J., 77, 246.
Marti, Karl, 47, 77, 106, 110.
Massebieau, L., 323.
Massuet, René, 387.
Matthes, J. C., 33, 74, 197.
Mayerhoff, L., 194, 197.
Mead, G. R. S., 387.
Megethius, 105.
Menzies, Allan, 131.
Merx, Adalbert, 91, 147, 150, 248, 306.
Meyboom, H. U., 197.
Meyer, Arnold, 30, 105, 106.
Meyer, Eduard, 70.
Michaelis, Johann David, 23.
Minucius Felix, 190.
Moore, George Foote, 61.
Morin, Jean, 20.
Mosheim, Johann Lorenz, 387.
Müller, Herrmann, 24.
Münster, Sebastian, 138.
Muss-Arnolt, W., 60.
Myrberg, O. F., 27.

Neander, August, 25, 96.
Nestle, Eberhard, 14.
Newman, A. H., 19.
Newton, Isaac, 21.
Nicole, Pierre, 333.
Niese, Benedict, 181, 258.
Nöldeke, Theodor, 26, 106.
Nösgen, C. F., 99.
Noyes, George R., 24.

Oefele, Felix, 244.
Ohle, R., 255.
Olshausen, Justus, 42.
Oort, H. L., 103.
Origen, 82, 145, 171.
Overbeck, Franz Camillo, 178.

Paine, Thomas, 23.
Palfrey, John G., 24.
Papias, 183.
Parker, Theodore, 24.
Parmenides, 163.
Pascal, Blaise, 333.
Paulus, H. E. G., 23, 96.
Peiser, F. E., 50.
Penn, William, 22.
Pereira, Bento, 20.
Peritz, Ismar, 370.
Pfleiderer, Erich, 164.

Pfleiderer, Otto, 26, 106, 184 f., 196, 202, 208, 246, 323.
Philo, 31, 55, 81, 146, 160, 162, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 179, 249, 304, 323.
Philaster, 160.
Photius, 181.
Pierson, Allard, 74, 197.
Piscator, Johannes, 21, 138.
Plato, 160, 164, 165.
Pliny the Younger, 175, 192, 195.
Ploss, H. H., 55.
Polycarp, 189, 191, 194.
Polycrates, 210.
Porphyry, 12, 16.
Porter, Frank C., 47.
Preuschen, Erwin, 80.
Ptolemy, 15.

Quadratus, 183.

Rab Abina, 181.
Rab Jose, 181.
Ramsay, William M., 241.
Reimarus, Hermann Samuel, 22.
Reinach, Solomon, 181.
Renan, Ernest, 29.
Renato, Camillo, 137.
Réville, Albert, 30, 207.
Réville, Jean, 163, 169, 208.
Rhees, Rush, 105, 115.
Ritschl, Albrecht, 27, 102.
Roehrich, G. G., 139.
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 23.
Rydberg, Viktor, v, 27, 101.

Sand, Christoph, 390.
Sanday, William, 130 f., 263.
Scaliger, Joseph, 189.
Schaff, Philip, 14.
Schechter, Solomon, 90.
Schelling, F. W. J., 346, 347.
Schenkel, Daniel, 14.
Schleiermacher, F. E. D., 24, 96, 193.
Schmidt, Carl, 387.
Schmidt, J. G. C., 193, 196.
Schmiedel, Paul, 106, 109 f., 112 f., 177, 208, 393, 396.
Schmoller, Otto, 32.
Schueckenburger, Matthias, 60
Schnedermann, G. H., 99.
Scholten, J. H., 26, 207.
Scholten, W., 98.
Schopenhauer, Arthur, 347.
Schulz, David, 13.
Schürer, Emil, 164, 181, 241, 258.
Schuster, Paul, 164.
Schurmann, Anna Maria van, 22.
Schwegler, Albert, 25, 193, 207.
Schweizer, Alexander, 212.
Scrivener, F. H. J., 14.
Sellin, Ernst, 47.
Semler, Johann Salomo, 13, 23, 175, 193, 199, 387.
Seneca, Lucius Annaeus, 174, 198 f., 328.
Serapion of Antioch, 206.
Servetus, Michael, 20, 137 f., 139 f., 328, 330, 391.
Siegfried, Karl, 163, 167.
Simon, Richard, 21.
Smith, Adam, 323.
Smith, W. B., 197.
Smith, William Robertson, 27, 29, 71.
Söderblom, Nathan, 80, 317.
Soulier, A., 163, 168.
Sozzini, Lelio, 137, 390, 391.
Sozzini, Fausto, 140.
Spallanzani, Lazaro, 25.
Spencer, Herbert, 25.
Spener, Jakob, 22.
Spinoza, Baruch, 22, 335.
Spitta, Friedrich, 208.
Stade, Bernhard, 28, 47, 59, 76.
Staerk, Willy, 106.
Stave, Erik, 45.
Steindorff, Georg, 55.
Steck, Rudolph, 176, 185, 194, 196, 197.
Stevens, George B., 106, 120.

Storr, G. C., 101.
Straatman, J. W., 199, 395 f.
Strabo, 55.
Strauss, David Friedrich, 24, 85, 98, 207, 387.
Suetonius, 177, 178.

Tacitus, 176, 177, 178.
Tatian, 171, 183, 208.
Tauler, Johann, 18.
Tertullian, 105, 171, 241.
Trajan, 176.
Tregelles, S. P., 13.
Thales, 163.
Thayer, Joseph Henry, 150.
Theodotion, 16.
Theophilus of Antioch, 171, 208.
Thoma, A., 208.
Thomas à Kempis, 18.
Tiele, C. P., 45.
Tischendorf, A. F. C., 14.
Toland, John, 21, 140.
Tolstoi, Leo, 317.
Torrey, C. C., 73.
Toy, C. H., 27.
Treschel, Friedrich, 390.
Turner, C. H., 241.

Uloth, C. E. B., 104.
Usener, Hermann, 56, 246, 249.
Usteri, J. M., 99.
Usteri, L., 193.

Valdez, Juan, 138.
Valentinus, 15, 29, 170, 208, 211, 389.
Van Loon, F., 197.
Van Manen, W. C., 103, 106, 113, 175, 185, 186, 195, 196, 197, 199, 200, 208.
Vatablus, F., 138.
Vatke, Wilhelm, 24.
Vermigli, Pietro, 138.
Vernes, Maurice, 77.
Vischer, Eberhard, 184.
Völter, Daniel, 250.
Volkmar, Gustav, 30, 102 f., 181, 191, 257.
Vollborth, J. C., 387.
Voltaire, F. M. A., 23.
Volz, Paul, 47.

Weinel, Heinrich, 71.
Weiss, Bernhard, 13, 98.
Weiss, Johannes, 32, 104.
Weisse, C. H., 26, 96 f., 101, 212.
Weizsäcker, Carl, 26, 99, 208.
Wellhausen, Julius, 28, 44, 50, 72, 82, 104 f., 106, 108, 112, 114, 150, 184 f., 243, 317.
Wendland, P., 323.
Wendt, Heinrich, 98, 212.
Wernle, Paul, 123.
Westcott, B. F., 13.
Westerburg, E., 175.
Whiston, William, 140.
White, Andrew D., 34.
Whiton, James M., x.
Wieseler, K. G., 180.
Wikner, Pontus, 27.
Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Ulrich, 64.
Wilke, C. G., 101.
Williams, Rowland, 27.
Willrich, Hugo, 50.
Winckler, Hugo, 57, 65.
Wiszowazzi, Andreas, 390.
Wittichen, Carl, 99.
Wolf, Christian, 23.
Woolston, Thomas, 21.
Wrede, Wilhelm, 30, 103, 149, 196.

Xenophanes, 163.

Zeller, Eduard, 25, 255.
Zeno, 165.
Zinzendorf, Nicholas, 22, 23.
Zwingli, Ulrich, 18.

III. INDEX OF TEXTS

GENESIS
i, 2 65
iii, 15....36, 39
iv, 3 58
vi, 1 ff....78, 142 f.
vii, 1 ff. 53
ix, 25-27....37, 39 f.
xiv, 1 ff. 57
xv, 17....54, 63
xvii, 1 ff. 53
xvii, 3....37, 40, 41
xxii, 1 ff. 54
xxviii, 1 ff. 54
xxxv, 14 71
xxxviii, 13 71
xlix, 10....37, 41, 80

EXODUS
iii, 2,....55, 63
iv, 22 154
vii, 16 62
x, 25 ff. 62
xi, 1-8 62
xii, 1 ff. 53
xiv, 21 ff. 53
xvi, 1 ff. 53
xvii, 1 ff. 53
xxv, 9 65

LEVITICUS
xix, 12, ...302
xx, 10 373
xxiv, 18 301
xxiv, 20 301

NUMBERS
xxiv, 17....37, 41, 80, 88, 246

DEUTERONOMY
i, 31 154
viii, 5 154
xiv, 1 154
xviii, 15....37, 41
xxii, 22 ff. 373
xxiii, 19, 20....305
xxxii, 6 154
xxxii, 8 143

JUDGES
viii, 27 61

I SAMUEL
ii, 25 95
x, 2 49
x, 9 143
xiv, 10 71
xvi, 13 71

II SAMUEL
vii, 2 ff....44, 69, 72
xiv, 17 43
xiv, 20 43

II KINGS
xix, 15 71

ISAIAH
i, 2 154
ii, 1 ff. 38
vii, 14....38, 46, 249
viii, 23....38, 92
ix, 1 ff. 243
ix, 5 ff ...38, 43, 47, 70, 74, 80
ix, 6 144
xi, 1 ff 38, 70, 74
xix, 16-25....76
xxiv-xxvii 77
xxx, 1 154
xlv, 3 140
xlix-lv 74
xlix, 16 65
lii, 13-liii, 12....38, 48
liii, 7....56, 92
liii, 9 398
lix, 20....38, 48
lx, 1 ff. 246
lxi, 1 ff....38, 48
lxiv, 8 154

JEREMIAH
iii, 4 154
iii, 19 154
ix, 25 55
xxiii, 5, 6....38, 48
xxx, 8 74
xxxi, 9 154
xxxi, 15....38, 49

xxxi, 22.....38, 49, 38
xxxi, 31.....38, 49
EZEKIEL
xi, 10.....38, 49
xvii, 22.....38, 74
xxi, 32.....38, 49
xxxiii, 15.....38, 49
xxxiv, 23, 24.....38
xxxvii, 24 ff. 38
xl, 1 ff.....55, 63
HOSEA
ii, 1 154
vi, 2.....38, 45, 321
xi, 1.....38, 45, 247
JOEL
iii, 1.....38, 45 f.
AMOS
ix, 11 ff.....46, 74
OBADIAH
vs. 18.....38, 46
JONAH
i, 11 ff.....38, 46
ii, 1 321
MICAH
iv-vii 46
v, 1 246
v, 1, 2.....38
v, 2 46
HAGGAI
ii, 7.....39, 50
ii, 23 74
ZECHARIAH
i, 6 74
iii, 7 71
iii, 8.....39, 50
iv, 6 ff. 74
iv, 14 71
vi, 12 39
ix, 9.....39, 50, 138
xi, 12 39
xii, 10 91
xiii, 7.....39, 50
MALACHI
iii, 1.....39, 51, 61, 63
PSALMS
ii, 1 ff.....37, 43, 44, 72
viii, 1 ff.....37, 42
xvi, 1 ff.....37, 42
xvi, 8-11 320
xviii, 1 ff. 43
xx, 1 ff.....43
xxi, 1 ff 37, 43
xxii, 1 ff.....37, 42
xxiv, 1 ff.....37, 42
xl, 1 ff 37, 42, 43
xli, 10.....37, 43
xlv, 1 ff.....37, 43, 44, 72
l, 1 ff. 255
lvii, 2 43
lxi, 1 ff. 43
lxiii, 1 ff. 43
lxv, 1 ff. 255
lxviii, 19.....37, 43
lxxii, 1 ff.....37, 44, 45, 72
lxxiii, 15 154
lxxxii, 1 ff. 43
lxxxiv, 1 ff. 43
lxxxix, 1 ff.....43, 44
cx, 1 ff.....37, 43, 44, 77, 80
cxviii, 22.....37, 43
cxxxii, 1 ff. 43
PROVERBS
viii, 22 ff.....38, 45
JOB
xix, 25, 26.....37, 41, 42
CANTICLES
i, 1 ff.....38, 45
ECCLESIASTES
i, 1 ff. 81
ESTHER
vi, 14 155
DANIEL
iii, 25 119
vii, 13..38, 50, 85, 97, 100, 115, ...118, 119, 128, 132
viii, 15 119
ix, 21 119
ix, 24-27.....38, 50
x, 5.....119, 138

x, 16 119
xii, 6, 7.....119, 138
NEHEMIAH
vi, 7 72
I MACCABEES
xiv, 41 44
xiv, 46 77
II MACCABEES
ii, 5 ff. 87
III MACCABEES
vi, 28 155
ECCLESIASTICUS
iv, 11 154
xxiii, 1 ff. 154
xlvii, 11 68
xlviii, 10 75
li, 1 ff. 152
li, 12 (Hebrew addition),...90
WISDOM OF SOLOMON
ii, 18 154
v, 5 147
xviii, 13 155
JUDITH
ix, 4 155
ENOCH (Ethiopic)
i-xxxvi 78
xxxvii-lxxi..30, 84, 85, 86, 92,
.....125, 132, 192
xxxvii, 1 ff. 85
xxxviii, 1 ff. 85
xxxix, 1, 2a.....85
xxxix, 3-13 85
xl, 1 ff. 85
xli, 1, 2.....85
xli, 3-8 85
xlii, 1 ff. 85
xliii, 1 ff. 85
xliv, 1 ff. 85
xlv, 3, 4.....85
xlvi, 1 ff.....85, 117
xlvi, 2, 3, 4.....101
xlvi, 3.....85, 119
xlvi, 2, 5, 6.....85
xlvii, 1 ff. 85
xlviii, 1 ff. 85
xlviii, 2 101
xlviii, 8-10 85
l, 1 ff. 85
li, 1 ff. 85
liii, 1-5 85
liii, 6 85
liv, 1-6, 7.....85
lv, 2, 3, 4.....85
lvi, 1 ff. 85
lvii, 1 ff. 85
lviii, 1 ff. 85
lx, 1 ff. 85
lxi, 8, 9.....85
lxii, 1 ff. 85
lxii, 7, 9, 14.....101
lxiii, 1 ff. 85
lxiii, 11 101
lxv, 1-lxix, 25.....85
lxix, 26 f., 29.....101
lxix, 26 ff. 85
lxx, 1 ff. 85
lxxi, 1 ff. 85
lxxi, 1 ff. 101
lxxxvii-xc 78
lxxxvii, 2 119
lxxxix, 52 78
xc, 38 79
xci, 12-19 79
xci-civ 79
xciii, 3 ff. 79
cv, 2 144
ENOCH (Slavonic)
lix, 2 81
APOCALYPSE OF BARUCH
vi, 1 ff. 87
xxix, 3 83
xxx, 1 83
xxxix, 7 83
xl, 3 83
lxxii, 2-6 83
APOCALYPSE OF EZRA
v, 56 84
vi, 6 84
vi, 58 155
vii, 28 ff.....83, 144

ix, 43 ff. 84
x, 44 ff. 84
xii, 31 ff. 84
xii, 32, 37, 52....144
xiii, 1 ff....84, 101, 117
xiv, 9 145
JUBILEES
xxxi, 18 82
TESTAMENTS OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS
Dan. vi, 1 ff....82
ASSUMPTION OF MOSES
i, 6 82
ix, 1 ff. 82
x, 27 155
PSALTER OF SOLOMON
vii, 30 155
xvii, 4 89
xvii, 5 89
xvii, 21 89
xvii, 36 68
SIBYLLINE ORACLES
III, 46-62 80
III, 47, 48 81
III, 75-92 80
III, 286 77
III, 652-660....76, 77
III, 702 155
MATTHEW
i, 1 ff....69, 89
i, 1-17 247
i, 6, ...317
i, 16 248
i, 18-ii, 23....249
ii, 1 ff. 243
ii, 6 246
ii, ...247
ii, 23 243
iii, 17....146
iv, 1 ff. 148
iv, 3-6 146
iv, 1-11 262
iv, 1-17 298
v, 9....146, 155
v, 11 123
v, 27-30 372
v, 32 304
v, 45....155, 268
v, 48 313
vi, 1-4 316
vi, 5 311
vi, 5-8 314
vi, 9 ff. 153
vi, 14 317
vi, 16-18 314
vi, 22 ff. 301
vi, 33 299
vi, 42 305
vii, 11....155, 313
vii, 17 ff. 300
viii, 5 ff. 267
viii, 20....105, 111, 121, 124
ix, 6....95, 121, 125, 268
ix, 9-13 268
ix, 14-17 269
ix, 16 f. 314
x, 23....96, 121, 122
x, 32 123
xi, 1 ff 270
xi, 2 ff....261, 266
xi, 7 ff. 267
xi, 9 105
xi, 19....121, 124, 269
xi, 25 ff. 151
xi, 27 146
xii, 1 ff. 270
xii, 8....94, 121, 125
xii, 27 264
xii, 28 265
xii, 32...95, 105, 112, 121, 124
xii, 40....121, 124, 321
xii, 46 321
xiii, 1 ff. 308
xiii, 31 f. 308
xiii, 33 308
xiii, 37-41 ....121 f.
xiii, 47 ff. 308
xiv, 2....266, 320
xiv, 3 258
xiv, 33 146
xvi, 13 94
xvi, 13, 14....46, 112, 113, 320

xvi, 13-20.....121 f.
xvi, 16.....146, 148
xvi, 27.....121, 125
xvi, 28 .....121 f.
xvii, 1 ff. 148
xvii, 5 146
xvii, 9 121
xvii, 10-13 124
xvii, 12.....121, 125
xvii, 22.....121, 125
xviii, 11 123
xviii, 18 107
xix, 9 304
xix, 10-12 372
xix, 11 f. 304
xix, 18 ff. 317
xix, 28 f.....121, 123
xx, 1-16 311
xx, 18.....121, 125
xx, 28.....121, 124
xxi, 12 ff. 306
xxi, 33-46.....152, 312
xxii, 1-14 152
xxii, 41-46 89
xxiii, 8 ff. 155
xxiii, 37 ff. 86
xxiv, 4-36.....86, 102, 184
xxiv, 24 f. 88
xxiv, 27 .....121, 124
xxiv, 30.....121, 123, 124
xxiv, 36.....146, 147
xxiv, 37.....121, 124
xxiv, 39.....121, 124
xxiv, 44.....121, 124
xxv, 14 ff. 307
xxv, 31 ff.....86, 121, 123
xxvi, 2 .....121, 123
xxvi, 24.....121, 124, 125
xxvi, 45.....121, 124
xxvi, 50 123
xxvi, 52 306
xxvi, 63 146
xxvi, 64.....121, 125
xxvii, 7 147
xxvii, 9 124
xxvii, 30 125
xxvii, 40 146
xxvii, 52 f. 320
xxvii, 54 146
xxviii, 1 321
xxviii, 1-8 394
xxviii, 1-20 .....394 f.
xxviii, 4 395
xxviii, 7 393
xxviii, 16 392
xxviii, 16-20 392
xxviii, 19 146

MARK

i, 1 .....146 f.
i, 11 146
ii, 10.....105, 107, 121, 125
ii, 13-17 268
ii, 23 ff.....108, 270
ii, 26 270
ii, 28.....95, 105, 121, 125
iii, 11.....146, 148
iii, 13 ff. 270
iv, 26-29 309
v, 7.....146, 148
vi, 3 ff. 251
vi, 14-16 320
vi, 15 320
vi, 17 258
viii, 28 320
viii, 31.....121, 124
viii, 38.....121, 125, 128
ix, 1 122
ix, 7 146
ix, 8 124
ix, 9 121
ix, 11-13.....118, 124
ix, 12 121
ix, 31.....121, 125
x, 11, 12.....304
x, 23 125
x, 29 123
x, 33 121
x, 45.....121, 124
xii, 1 ff. 312
xii, 26 f. 118
xii, 35-37 89
xiii, 5-32.....86, 102, 184

xiii, 26.....106, 121, 125
xiii, 32 147
xiv, 1 f. 123
xiv, 21.....118, 121, 124, 125
xiv, 41 .....121, 124
xiv, 61 146
xiv, 62.....121, 125
xv, 39.....146, 150
xvi, 1-8 394
xvi, 9-20.....392, 394
LUKE
i, 5 241
i, 5-25 250
i, 32 ff.....146, 148
i, 34, 35.....146, 250
i, 41 250
i, 46-55 250
i, 57-80 250
ii, 2 241
ii, 8 ff. 247
ii, 39 247
ii, 41-51 251
iii, 1.....241, 256
iii, 19 f. 258
iii, 22.....146, 148
iii, 23 250
iii, 23 ff. 69
iii, 28-38 247
iii, 38.....146, 147
iv, 1-13 262
iv, 3 146
iv, 9 146
iv, 16-30 263
iv, 25-27 312
v, 24 .....121, 125
v, 27-32 268
vi, 5.....121, 125
vi, 22.....121, 123
vi, 43 ff. 300
vii, 1-10 267
vii, 13 ff. 270
vii, 34.....121, 124, 128
viii, 2 269
viii, 3, ...271
viii, 28.....146, 148 f.
ix, 2 121
ix, 7-9 320
ix, 8 320
ix, 19 320
ix, 22 124
ix, 26.....121, 125, 128
ix, 27 122
ix, 35 146
ix, 44.....121, 125
ix, 58.....121, 124
x, 21 ff.....147, 151
x, 29-37 312
xi, 2 ff. 153
xi, 30.....121, 124
xi, 40 85
xi, 49 184
xii, 8.....121, 123
xii, 10.....121, 124
xii, 11 f. 122
xii, 31 299
xii, 40 121
xii, 46 124
xii, 70 146
xiii, 4 268
xiii, 32 266
xiv, 15-24 152
xv, 3-7 311
xv, 8-10 311
xv, 11 ff. 311
xvi, 1 ff. 307
xvii, 10 311
xvii, 20 ff.....123, 309
xvii, 22 121
xvii, 24.....121, 124
xvii, 26.....121, 124
xvii, 30.....121, 124
xviii, 8.....121, 124
xviii, 9-14 313
xviii, 16 266
xviii, 29 123
xviii, 31.....121, 125
xix, 10.....121, 123
xix, 11 ff. 307
xx, 9 ff. 312
xx, 27-40.....312, 372
xx, 36.....145, 156
xx, 41-44 89

xxi, 8-36.....86, 102, 184
xxi, 27.....121, 125
xxi, 34-36.....121, 123
xxii, 1 f. 123
xxii, 18 298
xxii, 22.....121, 125
xxii, 24 ff. 303
xxii, 27-30 124
xxii, 28 262
xxii, 36 306
xxii, 48.....121, 123, 128
xxii, 69.....121, 125
xxii, 70 146
xxiii, 47 150
xxiv, 1 ff. 392
xxiv, 6 393
xxiv, 7 121
xxiv, 16 320
xxvii, 7 123

JOHN

i, 1 159
i, 14 159
i, 18.....13, 14, 157
i, 34 157
i, 50 157
i, 51 121
ii, 1 321
ii, 20 242
iii, 13 121
iii, 14 121
iii, 16, 17, 18.....157
iii, 35, 36.....157
iv, 5 ff. 87
iv, 23 379
v, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26....157
v, 27 121
vi, 40 157
vi, 53.....53, 56, 121
vi, 62 121
vi, 63 56
vi, 69 157
vii, 52-viii, 11.....206
viii, 28 121
viii, 35 f. 157
viii, 57 157
ix, 35 121
x, 33 ff. 158
x, 36 157
xi, 4, 37.....157
xii, 23, 34.....121
xiii, 31.....121, 128
xiv, 13 157
xvi, 1 157
xvii, 11 157
xix, 7 320
xx, 1 ff. 392
xx, 9 320
xx, 29 158
xx, 31 157
xxi, 1 ff.....392, 393, 395

ACTS

ii, 25 ff. 320
v, 36 87
vii, 56 113
xiii, 34 ff. 320
xvii, 1 196
xviii, 1 f. 178

ROMANS

i, 1 ff. 196-204
ix, 11.....53, 54

I CORINTHIANS

i, 1 ff. 196-204
x, 1-4.....53, 56
xv, 3-8.....395, 397
xv, 4.....320, 321
xv, 5-11 200
xv, 20 320
xv, 45-49 53
xv, 49 65

II CORINTHIANS

i, 1 ff. .....196 ff.
i, 8 380

GALATIANS

i, 1 ff. .....196 ff.
iii, 19 54
iv, 26 ff. 62

I THESSALONIANS

i, 1 ff. 196

II THESSALONIANS

i, 1 ff. 196
i, 8 380

EPHESIANS
i, 1 ff.....193 f., 200 f.
i, 15-17 194
COLOSSIANS
i, 1 ff.....194
i, 4 194
PHILEMON
vs. 1 ff. 194
vss. 4-6 194
PHILIPPIANS
i, 1 195
iv, 3 195
TITUS
i, 1 ff. 193
I TIMOTHY
i, 1 ff. 193
II TIMOTHY
i, 1 ff. 193
HEBREWS
i, 1 ff. 193
viii, 1 ff. 53
ix, 13, 14.....54
ix, 23, 24.....65
ix, 24 54
xi, 10 53
xii, 24 54
I PETER
i, 1 ff. 192
iii, 17 53
II PETER
i, 1 ff. 193
ii, 11 11
I JOHN
i, 1 ff. 192
II JOHN
i, 1 ff. 192
III JOHN
i, 1 ff. 192
JAMES
i, 1 ff. 192
JUDE
i, 1 ff. 191
REVELATION
i, 1 ff. 184
i, 13.....113, 119
xi, 1, 2.....82
xi-xiii 184
xii, 1 ff.....82, 84
xiv, 14.....113, 119
xvii-xviii 184
xviii, 16 258
xix, 13 169
xxi, 10 65
GOSPEL OF PETER
1 ff. 206, 207
58 ff.....392, 394, 395
GOSPEL OF HEBREWS
1 ff.....205, 206, 259, 261
GOSPEL OF EBIONITES
1 ff. 206, 260
GOSPEL OF EGYPTIANS
1 ff. 206
GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS
1 ff. 207
PROTEVANGELIUM JACOBI
1 ff. 207
LOGIA JESU
1 ff. 170, 206
PREDICATIO PAULI
1 ff. 259, 260
DIDACHE
1 ff.....183, 194, 397
BARNABAS
1 ff. 187
HERMAS
1 ff. 183, 184
CLEMENT
I Epistle 187, 188
II Epistle 188
Homilies 187
Recognitions 187
IGNATIUS
Romans, etc. 188-191
POLYCARP
Philippians 191
TARGUMS
To Exodus xl, 11.....91
I Samuel xxiv, 7.....149
II Samuel vii, 14.....145
Zech. iv, 7.....92

Psalm ii, 7.....145
Psalm xviii, 7.....149
Canticles iv, 5.....91

MISHNA

Jadiam iv, 6.....182
Shabbath i, 3.....252

SHEMONEH ESREH

14, 15, 17.....90

BERESHITH RABBA

100 321

KOHELETH RABBA

To i, 8.....182

TOSEPHTA

Chullin ii, 24.....182

PALESTINIAN TALMUD

Shabbath 14.....247

BABYLONIAN TALMUD

Aboda Zara 16 b.....182, 252
Aboda Zara 17 a..182, 243, 252
Bekoroth 8 a.....182
Chullin 27 b.....182
Megilla 70 a 246
Menachoth 65 b.....182
Sanhedrin 98 b 83
Sanhedrin 107 b 247
Shabbath 104 b.....247
Shabbath 116 a.....182
Sota 47 a 247
Sukka 52 a 91
Taanith 68 d 88

THE GOSPEL FOR AN AGE OF DOUBT

By HENRY VAN DYKE, D.D., LL.D.

Cloth, 12mo., $1.25

"Dr. van Dyke's 'Gospel for an Age of Doubt,' which is often called the finest apologetic of modern times, is constantly coming out in new editions. It is a book that ought to be in the hands — and heart — of every thoughtful Christian of the day."—*The Interior*, Chicago.

"Dr. van Dyke's lectures form one of the most eloquent defences of Christianity that we have yet met with."—*The Academy*, London.

"The most vital, suggestive, helpful book we know in the whole range of theological writing at this period."—*The New York Times.*

THE GOSPEL FOR A WORLD OF SIN

By HENRY VAN DYKE, D.D., LL.D.

Cloth, 12mo., $1.25

"His former volume, 'The Gospel for an Age of Doubt,' was but a preparation for the discussion of this larger and more profoundly interesting subject. . . . Just the book we need."—DR. S. B. ROSSITER, *N. Y. Observer.*

"A book for the times."—*Christian Intelligencer.*

"Sure to prove of immense value in leading the thought of the day."—*Congregationalist.*

"The work is one to charm and satisfy."—*Plain Dealer*, Cleveland.

"One of the basic books of true Christian thought of to-day and of all times."—*Boston Courier.*

THE QUEST OF HAPPINESS

A Study of Victory Over Life's Troubles

By NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS

Pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn; Author of "The Influence of Christ in Modern Life," etc.

Cloth, with colored page borders, $1.50 net

"'The Quest of Happiness' is Dr. Hillis's very best book. It is strong, vivid, clear, and has a certain indefinable human quality which will be sure to give it a large circulation and make it a source of great helpfulness. I especially enjoyed the 'Forewords.' They would make an attractive volume in themselves."—AMORY H. BRADFORD, *Pastor First Congregational Church, Montclair, N. J.*

"Like everything from Dr. Hillis, 'The Quest of Happiness' is original in conception and eloquent in expression. It is a book sure of a wide and helpful influence. I can scarcely think of any better service that could be rendered the crowds out in search of happiness than to acquaint them with this guide-book to the Land they are looking for."—CHARLES WOOD, *Second Presbyterian Church, Philadelphia.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

FROM EPICURUS TO CHRIST

A Study in the Principles of Personality

By WILLIAM DE WITT HYDE

Cloth, 12mo., $1.50 net

"Four schools of thought in classic Greece emphasized each a feature of personality. Christianity takes up into itself all that was sound in each, and incorporates it, cleared of excess or perversion, into the complete conception. This in brief is what Dr. Hyde tells us. But let no one imagine that a book thus concisely described is for students of grizzled antiquity. On the contrary, it is intensely, incisely modern. It is the modern representatives of Epicurus, Plato, Marcus Aurelius, with whom it is concerned, and their missing of the ideal of personality that it describes and satirizes; the modern evils resulting in individual, domestic, social, political life that it exposes and condemns. Consequently it is alive with present-day interests. In its exposition of the Christian conception of personality, it holds that the omission of any truth for which the ancient systems stood mutilates and impoverishes the Christian view of life."—*The Outlook.*

PERSONAL AND IDEAL ELEMENTS IN EDUCATION

By HENRY CHURCHILL KING

President of Oberlin College; Author of "Theology and the Social Consciousness" and "Reconstruction in Theology"

Cloth, $1.50 net; postage, 11 cents

Dr. King's addresses and papers for various occasions deal with the problem of the College in distinction from the University; with the relation of Religion to Education, Ethics, and Life; with the conditions imposed on Religious Education by Psychology and Pedagogy; with the Educational and Evangelistic methods of Christian training as compared, and with the ethical, psychological, and physical conditions of character building. The central idea running through the whole is the superiority of personality to mechanism, the sacredness of personality, and the means of its best development.

THEOLOGY AND THE SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS

A Study of the Relations of the Social Consciousness to Theology

By HENRY CHURCHILL KING

President of Oberlin College; Author of "Reconstruction in Theology," etc.

Cloth, 12mo., $1.25 net

"The strength of Professor King's eminently sane and helpful book is not in brilliant and suggestive sentences, but in its clear unfolding of an elemental truth, and fearless and vigorous application of that truth to religious thinking. One cannot read it carefully without realizing that his thinking has been cleared of much mistiness, and that he has a deepened conception of a truth of superlative importance, to which he has but to be steadily loyal to find a rational interpretation of his spiritual experience, and a safe guide amid the mazes of theological speculation."—*The Congregationalist.*

RECONSTRUCTION IN THEOLOGY

By HENRY CHURCHILL KING

President of Oberlin College

Cloth, 12mo., $1.50

FROM THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE:

"A new constructive period in theology, it may well be believed, is at hand. This book has been written with the earnest desire and hope that it may contribute something toward the forwarding of a movement already going on—a really spiritual reconstruction of theology in terms that should bring it home to our own day. The book aims, first, to show that such a reconstruction is needed and demanded, because of the changed intellectual, moral, and spiritual world in which we live; and then, to characterize briefly, but sufficiently, this new world of our day; and finally, to indicate the influence which these convictions of our time ought to have upon theological conception and statement, especially in bringing us to a restatement of theology in terms of personal relation. It has been a constant desire of the writer to help intelligent laymen, as well as theological students and ministers, to a more thorough and sympathetic understanding of the great convictions and scholarly movements of the day."

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

THE INFLUENCE OF CHRIST IN MODERN LIFE

Being a Study of the New Problems of the Church in American Society

By NEWELL DWIGHT HILLIS, D. D.

Author of "The Quest of Happiness," etc., etc.

Cloth, 12mo., $1.50

"The book as a whole is not only interesting, but makes a strong appeal for Christian living . . . expressed in a language that makes it timely and infused with a spirit that gives it power."—*New York Commercial Advertiser.*

"The influence of his pages can only be to nerve the reader, while facing frankly all which hinders the progress of the gospel, to believe in and labor for it . . . These chapters touch one by their manly sympathy, and candor, while they also delight by their genuine eloquence."—*The Congregationalist.*

JESUS CHRIST AND THE SOCIAL QUESTION

An Examination of the Teaching of Jesus in its Relation to Some Problems of Modern Social Life

By FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY

Author of "The Religion of an Educated Man," etc.

Cloth, 12mo., $1.50

"In this 'Examination of the Teaching of Jesus in its Relation to Some of the Problems of Modern Social Life,' Professor Peabody begins with *a careful discussion of the comprehensiveness of this teaching as at once perfectly apt and adequate* to every possible condition and need. He then considers the social principles of this teaching; its relation to the family, to the rich, to the care of the poor, to the industrial order. The concluding chapter is especially good, setting forth 'the Correlation of the Social Questions.' It is shown how this fact should affect those who are actually interested in particular reforms."—*Times-Herald*, Chicago.

THE RELIGION OF AN EDUCATED MAN

Three Lectures

By FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY

Dean of the Divinity School, Harvard University

Cloth, 12mo., $1.00 net

"They are pregnant with suggestion and reveal a depth of broad Christian scholarship together with a keen insight into the demands of the modern world upon the scholar."—*New York Commercial Advertiser.*

"His logic is sound, and the sane, temperate tone of his essays invites conviction."—*Milwaukee Sentinel.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY, 64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

Date Due

Thesis

Library Bureau Cat. no. 1137

BT
201
S353 30073
AUTHOR
Schmidt, N.
TITLE
Prophet of Nazareth

DATE LOANED	BORROWER'S NAME	DATE RETURNED
11/24	E Pearson	12/6
8-3-40	D.T. Jenkins Chevis	

Library Bureau Cat. No. 1157-A